arXiv:1209.2522v1 [math.AP] 12 Sep 2012

Positive Least Energy Solutions and Phase Separation for Coupled Schrödinger Equations with Critical Exponent(Dim≥ 5)*

Zhijie Chen, Wenming Zou

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University,

Beijing 100084, China

Abstract

We study the following critically coupled perturbed Brezis-Nirenberg problem (Bose-Einstein condensation system for the higher dimensional case):

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta u+\lambda_1 u=\mu_1 u^{2^*-1}+\beta u^{\frac{2^*}{2}-1}v^{\frac{2^*}{2}}, \quad x\in\Omega,\\ -\Delta v+\lambda_2 v=\mu_2 v^{2^*-1}+\beta v^{\frac{2^*}{2}-1}u^{\frac{2^*}{2}}, \quad x\in\Omega,\\ u\geq 0, v\geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u=v=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.\end{cases}$$

Here, $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N(N\geq 5)$ is a smooth bounded domain, $2^*:=\frac{2N}{N-2}$, $-\lambda_1(\Omega)<\lambda_1,\lambda_2<0$, $\mu_1,\mu_2>0$ and $\beta\neq 0$, where $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with the Dirichlet boundary condition. When $\beta=0$, this turn to be the well-known Brezis-Nirenberg problem. It is interesting that we can show that this system has a positive least energy solution *for any* $\beta\neq 0$. We also study the limit behavior of the least energy solutions in case $\beta\to-\infty$ and phase separation is expected. As an application of the phase separation, we obtain a least energy sign-changing solution of the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in case $N\geq 6$. In case $\lambda_1=\lambda_2$, the uniqueness of the positive least energy solutions is also studied. It turns out that some quite different phenomenons happen comparing to the special case $N=4$, which has been studied by the authors in another paper.

---

*Supported by NSFC (11025106, 10871109). E-mail address: chenzhijie1987@sina.com(Chen); wzou@math.tsinghua.edu.cn (Zou)

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the following coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 u^{2p-1} + \beta u^{p-1} v^p, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 v^{2p-1} + \beta v^{p-1} u^p, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ u \geq 0, v \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ or $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain, $p > 1$ and $p \leq 2^*/2$ if $N \geq 3$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ is a coupling constant. In the case $p = 2$, the cubic system (1.1) appears in many physical problems, especially in nonlinear optics and Bose-Einstein condensation. We refer for this to [2, 20, 21, 24], which also contain information about the physical relevance of non-cubic nonlinearities. In the subcritical case $p < 2^*/2$, the existence of solutions have received great interest recently, see [3, 7, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35] and references therein.

Remark that, all the papers mentioned above deal with the subcritical case. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existence results for (1.1) in the critical case $2p = 2^*$ in the literature. Recently, the authors considered the special critical case $p = 2$ and $N = 4$ in [17].

In this paper, we consider the existence of least energy solutions of (1.1) in more general critical case with higher dimensions. In the sequel we assume that

$$N \geq 5 \quad \text{and} \quad 2p = 2^*. \tag{1.2}$$

It turns out that different phenomenons happen comparing to the case $N = 4$ ([17]), see Remarks 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.6 below. If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ and (u, v) is any a solution of (1.1), then by the Pohozaev Identity and $E'(u, v)(u, v) = 0$, it is easy to get that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \lambda_1 u^2 + \lambda_2 v^2 \, dx = 0$, so $(u, v) \equiv (0, 0)$ if $\lambda_1\lambda_2 > 0$. Here E is the related functional defined in (1.4). Therefore, in the sequel we assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain . We call a solution (u, v) nontrivial if both $u \not\equiv 0$ and $v \not\equiv 0$, a solution (u, v) semi-trivial if (u, v) is type of $(u, 0)$ or $(0, v)$.

Let $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ be the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with the Dirichlet boundary condition. Note that (1.1) has semi-trivial solutions $(u_{\mu_1}, 0)$ and $(0, u_{\mu_2})$, where u_{μ_i} is a positive least energy solution of the well-known Brezis-Nirenberg problem

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_i u = \mu_i |u|^{2^*-2} u, \ u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \tag{1.3}$$

if $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$ (see [9]). Hence, system (1.1) is a critically coupled perturbed problem of the Brezis-Nirenberg problem. The Brezis-Nirenberg problem (1.3) has been studied by many authors, and it seems almost impossible to give a complete list of references. We refer the readers to [13, 14, 16, 18, 33] and references therein.

We are concerned with nontrivial solutions of (1.1). Define $H := H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$. It is well known that solutions of (1.1) correspond to the critical points of C^1 functional $E : H \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} E(u,v) =&\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2+\lambda_1 u^2)+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2+\lambda_2 v^2) \\ &-\frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega (\mu_1|u|^{2p}+2\beta|u|^p|v|^p+\mu_2|v|^{2p}). \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

We say a solution (u,v) of (1.1) is a least energy solution, if (u,v) is nontrivial and $E(u,v)\le E(\varphi,\psi)$ for any other nontrivial solution (φ,ψ) of (1.1). As in [25], we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}=\Big\{&(u,v)\in H, u\not\equiv 0, v\not\equiv 0, \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2+\lambda_1 u^2)=\int_\Omega (\mu_1|u|^{2p}+\beta|u|^p|v|^p), \\ &\int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2+\lambda_2 v^2)=\int_\Omega (\mu_2|v|^{2p}+\beta|u|^p|v|^p)\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then any nontrivial solutions of (1.1) has to belong to $\mathcal{M}$. Take $\varphi,\psi\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\varphi,\psi\not\equiv 0$ and $supp(\varphi)\cap supp(\psi)=\emptyset$, then there exists $t_1,t_2>0$ such that $(t_1\varphi,t_2\psi)\in\mathcal{M}$. So $\mathcal{M}\neq\emptyset$. We set

$$B:=\inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}} E(u,v)=\inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}}\frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2+\lambda_1 u^2+|\nabla v|^2+\lambda_2 v^2)\,dx. \tag{1.5}$$

First we consider the case $-\lambda_1(\Omega)<\lambda_1=\lambda_2=\lambda<0$. By [9] the Brezis-Nirenberg problem

$$-\Delta u+\lambda u=|u|^{2^*-2}u,\ \ u\in H_0^1(\Omega) \tag{1.6}$$

has a positive least energy solution ω with energy

$$B_1:=\frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega (|\nabla\omega|^2+\lambda\omega^2)\,dx=\frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega \omega^{2^*}\,dx. \tag{1.7}$$

Moreover,

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2+\lambda u^2)\,dx\ge (NB_1)^{2/N}\left(\int_\Omega |u|^{2^*}\,dx\right)^{2/2^*},\quad \forall\ u\in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{1.8}$$

Consider

$$\begin{cases}\mu_1 k^{p-1}+\beta k^{p/2-1}l^{p/2}=1,\\ \beta k^{p/2}l^{p/2-1}+\mu_2 l^{p-1}=1,\\ k>0,\ \ l>0.\end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

We will prove in Lemma 2.1 that there exists (k_0,l_0), such that

$$(k_0,l_0)\text{ satisfies (1.9) and }\ k_0=\min\{k\,:\,(k,l)\text{ is a solution of (1.9)}\}. \tag{1.10}$$

Our first result deals with the special case $\lambda_1=\lambda_2$.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that* $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda < 0$*. Let* (k_0, l_0) *in (1.10). Then for any* $\beta > 0$*,* $(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$ *is a positive solution of (1.1).*

Moreover, if $\beta \geq \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$*, then* $E(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega) = B$*, that is,* $(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$ *is a positive least energy solution of (1.1).*

Remark 1.1. *(1) In the case* $N = 4$ *and* $2p = 2^*$*, [17, Theorem 1.1] said that (1.1) has no nontrivial nonnegative solution if* $\beta \in [\min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}]$ *and* $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$*. Therefore, the general case* $N \geq 5$ *is quite different from the case* $N = 4$*. As we will see in Section 2, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is much more delicate than the proof of [17, Theorem 1.1].*

(2) Similarly as in [17, Remark 1.1], we can prove that, if Ω *is starshaped, the assumption* $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda < 0$ *in Theorem 1.1 is optimal.*

In case $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, we also study the uniqueness of the least energy solutions.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that* $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda < 0$ *and let* (k_0, l_0) *in (1.10). There exists* $\beta_0 \geq \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ *determined by* (μ_1, μ_2)*, and assume that* $\beta > \beta_0$*. Let* (u, v) *be any a positive least energy solution of (1.1), then* $(u, v) = (\sqrt{k_0}U, \sqrt{l_0}U)$*, where* U *is a positive least energy solution of (1.6). In particular, the positive least energy solution of (1.1) is unique if* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ *is a ball.*

Remark 1.2. *(1) We can give a precise definition of* β_0 *(see (4.2) in Section 4). In particular, if* $\mu_1 = \mu_2$*, then* $\beta_0 = \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$*.*

(2) For the case $p = 2$ *and* $N \leq 3$*, some uniqueness results about system (1.1) were introduced in [37]. However, their proofs heavily depend on* $p = 2$*, and can not work here.*

Now, let us consider the general case $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Our following result also deal with the case $\beta < 0$.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that* $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 < 0$*. Then system (1.1) has a positive least energy solution* (u, v) *with* $E(u, v) = B$ *for any* $\beta \neq 0$*.*

Remark 1.3. *For the general case* $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$*, when* $N = 4$ *and* $2p = 2^*$*, [17, Theorem 1.3] said that (1.1) has a positive least energy solution for any*

$$\beta \subset (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \beta_1) \cup (\beta_2, +\infty),$$

where $\beta_i, i = 1, 2$ *are some positive constants satisfying*

$$\beta_1 \leq \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\} \leq \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\} \leq \beta_2.$$

That is, we do not know whether the least energy solution exists or not if $\beta \in [\beta_1, \beta_2]$*. Comparing this with Theorem 1.3, we see that the general case* $N \geq 5$ *is completely different from the special case* $N = 4$*.*

Now, we study the limit behavior of the positive least energy solutions in the repulsive case $\beta \to -\infty$. It is expected that components of the limiting profile tend to separate in different regions of the underlying domain Ω. This phenomenon, called *phase separation*, has been well studied for L^∞ -bounded positive solutions of system (1.1) in subcritical case $2p < 2^*$ by [35, 36, 29]. The critical case $N = 4$ and $p = 2$ was studied by [17]. For other kinds of elliptic systems with strong competition, phase separation has also been well studied, we refer to [11, 12, 15] and references therein. Denote $\{u > 0\} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\}$. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume that* $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 < 0$. *Let* $\beta_n < 0,\ n \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfy* $\beta_n \to -\infty$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *and* (u_n, v_n) *be the positive least energy solutions of (1.1) with* $\beta = \beta_n$ *which exists by Theorem 1.3. Then* $\int_\Omega \beta_n u_n^p v_n^p \, dx \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *and passing to a subsequence, one of the following conclusions holds.*

(1) $u_n \to u_\infty$ *strongly in* $H_0^1(\Omega)$ *and* $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$ *weakly in* $H_0^1(\Omega)$ *(so* $v_n \to 0$ *for almost every* $x \in \Omega$*), where* u_∞ *is a positive least energy solution of*

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2} u,\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

(2) $v_n \to v_\infty$ *strongly in* $H_0^1(\Omega)$ *and* $u_n \rightharpoonup 0$ *weakly in* $H_0^1(\Omega)$ *(so* $u_n \to 0$ *for almost every* $x \in \Omega$*), where* v_∞ *is a positive least energy solution of*

$$-\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 |v|^{2^*-2} v,\ v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

(3) $(u_n, v_n) \to (u_\infty, v_\infty)$ *strongly in* $H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ *and* $u_\infty \cdot v_\infty \equiv 0$, *where* $u_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ *is a positive least energy solution of*

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2} u,\ u \in H_0^1(\{u_\infty > 0\}),$$

and $v_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ *is a positive least energy solution of*

$$-\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 |v|^{2^*-2} v,\ v \in H_0^1(\{v_\infty > 0\}).$$

Furthermore, both $\overline{\{v_\infty > 0\}}$ *and* $\{u_\infty > 0\}$ *are connected domains, and* $\{v_\infty > 0\} = \Omega \backslash \overline{\{u_\infty > 0\}}$.

In particular, if $N \ge 6$, *then only (3) holds.*

Remark 1.4. *Theorem 1.4 has been proved for the case* $N = 4$ *and* $2p = 2^*$ *by the authors([17]). The novelty here is that we can exclude conclusions (1)-(2) if* $N \ge 6$, *which can not be proved for the case* $N = 4$. *In the proof of Theorem 1.4-(3), a key point is to prove the continuity of* u_∞ *and* v_∞. *We remark here that, our proof of the continuity of* u_∞ *and* v_∞ *is completely different from that in [17] for the case* $N = 4$, *and can be used to the case* $N = 4$.

As an application of Theorem 1.4, we turn to consider the existence of least energy sign-changing solutions of the Brezis-Nirenberg problem

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2} u,\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \tag{1.11}$$

where $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 < 0$. Define

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 u^2)\,dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega \mu_1 |u|^{2^*}\,dx,\ u \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega)\backslash\{0\} : J'(u)u = 0\},\quad \mathcal{S}_{sc} := \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : u^+, u^- \in \mathcal{S}_0\},$$

$$c_{sc} := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{sc}} J(u),$$

where $u^\pm := \max\{\pm u, 0\}$. We say a sign-changing solution u of (1.11) satisfying $J(u) = c_{sc}$ a *least energy sign-changing solution.* For some subcritical elliptic problems, the existence of least energy sign-changing solutions has been well studied, see [10, 27, 32] and references therein. For the Brezis-Nirenberg problem (1.11), Cerami, Solimini and Struwe [14] showed that for $N \geq 6$, problem (1.11) has at least two nontrivial solutions, one of which changes sign. Recently Schechter and Zou [33] showed that (1.11) has infinitely many sign-changing solutions if $N \geq 7$. However, to the best of our acknowledge, there seems no existence results of the least energy sign-changing solutions in the literature. The main difficulty is to show the existence of some $u \in \mathcal{S}_{sc}$ such that $J(u) = c_{sc}$. Here we can answer this question in case $N \geq 6$ with the help of Theorem 1.4. Let $N \geq 6$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_1$ in Theorem 1.4. Then (u_∞, v_∞) in Theorem 1.4 satisfies (3), and so $u_\infty - v_\infty \in \mathcal{S}_{sc}$. We have the following result.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume $N \geq 6$. Let (u_∞, v_∞) be in Theorem 1.4 in the case where $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_1$. Then $u_\infty - v_\infty$ is a least energy sign-changing solution of (1.11).*

Remark 1.5. *As we will see in Section 5, Theorem 1.5 is a direct corollary of the existence of a least energy sign-changing solution of the following problem*

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u^+ - \lambda_2 u^- = \mu_1 (u^+)^{2^*-1} - \mu_2 (u^-)^{2^*-1},\quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \tag{1.12}$$

where $u^\pm = \max\{\pm u, 0\}$. Note that this general result has not been proved in the literature. Unfortunately, we can not show Theorem 1.5 for $N = 4, 5$. The reason is that we can not show that only (3) in Theorem 1.4 holds for $N = 4, 5$, which remains as a very interesting open problem.

Since the nonlinearity and the coupling term are both critical in (1.1), the existence of nontrivial solutions of (1.1) depends heavily on the existence of the least energy solution of the following limit problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_1 |u|^{2p-2} u + \beta |u|^{p-2} u |v|^p, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta v = \mu_2 |v|^{2p-2} v + \beta |v|^{p-2} v |u|^p, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u, v \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N), \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

where $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N) : |\nabla u| \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)\}$ with norm $\|u\|_{D^{1,2}} := (\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx)^{1/2}$. Let S be the sharp constant of $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \hookrightarrow L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \geq S \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{2^*} \, dx \right)^{\frac{2}{2^*}}. \tag{1.14}$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we consider the Aubin-Talenti instanton [1, 34] $U_{\varepsilon,y} \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ defined by

$$U_{\varepsilon,y}(x) := [N(N-2)]^{\frac{N-2}{4}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 + |x-y|^2} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}. \tag{1.15}$$

Then $U_{\varepsilon,y}$ satisfies $-\Delta u = |u|^{2^*-2}u$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U_{\varepsilon,y}|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U_{\varepsilon,y}|^{2^*} \, dx = S^{N/2}. \tag{1.16}$$

Furthermore, $\{U_{\varepsilon,y} : \varepsilon > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^N\}$ contains all positive solutions of the equation $-\Delta u = |u|^{2^*-2}u$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Note that (1.13) has semi-trivial solutions $(\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{4}} U_{\varepsilon,y}, 0)$ and $(0, \mu_2^{\frac{N-2}{4}} U_{\varepsilon,y})$. Here, we are only interested in nontrivial solutions of (1.13). Define $D := D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \times D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and a C^1 functional $I : D \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$I(u,v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) - \frac{1}{2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + 2\beta |u|^p |v|^p + \mu_2 |v|^{2p}). \tag{1.17}$$

As in [25], we consider the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} = \Big\{ &(u,v) \in D, u \not\equiv 0, v \not\equiv 0, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + \beta |u|^p |v|^p), \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_2 |v|^{2p} + \beta |u|^p |v|^p) \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then any nontrivial solutions of (1.13) has to belong to $\mathcal{N}$. Similarly as $\mathcal{M}$, we have $\mathcal{N} \neq \emptyset$. We set

$$A := \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}} I(u,v) = \inf_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 \, dx. \tag{1.18}$$

Then we have the following theorem, which plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.6. *(1) If $\beta < 0$, then A is not attained.*

(2) If $\beta > 0$, then (1.13) has a positive least energy solution (U, V) with $I(U, V) = A$, which is radially symmetric decreasing. Moreover,

(2-1) if $\beta \geq \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}$, then $I(\sqrt{k_0}U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0}U_{\varepsilon,y}) = A$, where (k_0, l_0) in (1.10). That is, $(\sqrt{k_0}U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0}U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is a positive least energy solution of (1.13).

(2-2) there exists $0 < \beta_1 \leq \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}$, and for any $0 < \beta < \beta_1$, there exists a solution $(k(\beta), l(\beta))$ of (1.9), such that

$$I(\sqrt{k(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y}) > A = I(U, V).$$

That is, $(\sqrt{k(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is a different positive solution of (1.13) with respect to (U, V).

Remark 1.6. *In the case $N = 4$ and $2p = 2^*$, [17, Theorem 1.5] said that (1.13) has no nontrivial nonnegative solution if $\beta \in [\min\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}, \max\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}]$ and $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$; $(\sqrt{k(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is a positive least energy solution of (1.13) if $0 < \beta < \min\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}$. Therefore, the general case $N \geq 5$ is completely different from the case $N = 4$. As we will see in Section 2, the idea of proving (2) of Theorem 1.6 in case $0 < \beta < \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}$, which also works for the case $\beta \geq \frac{2}{N-2}\max\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}$, is completely different from that in case $N = 4$ ([17]).*

We can also study the uniqueness of the positive least energy solutions of (1.13) just as Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.7. *Let β_0 be in Theorem 1.2 and assume that $\beta > \beta_0$. Let (u, v) be any a positive least energy solution of (1.13). Then $(u, v) = (\sqrt{k_0}U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0}U_{\varepsilon,y})$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$.*

The rest of this paper proves these theorems, and some ideas of the proofs are similar to those in [17]. However, as has pointed out in Remarks 1.1,1.3, 1.4 and 1.6, the general case $N \geq 5$ is different from $N = 4$, and some new ideas are needed. We give some notations here. Throughout this paper, we denote the norm of $L^q(\Omega)$ by $|u|_q = (\int_\Omega |u|^q\,dx)^{\frac{1}{q}}$, the norm of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ by $\|u\| = |\nabla u|_2$ and positive constants (possibly different) by C. The paper is organized as follows. Theorems 1.1 and 1.6 are proved in Section 2, and we will see that these proofs are more delicate than those in case $N = 4$ ([17]). In Section 3, we use Nehari manifold approach and Ekeland variational principle to prove Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta < 0$, and use mountain pass argument to Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta > 0$. In Section 4, we use an elementary approach to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.7. Finally, we use energy estimate methods to prove Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 in Section 5, where some different ideas are needed.

After the completion of this paper, we learned that (1.1) has been also studied in a recent preprint [23], where the author showed the existence of least energy solutions for $\beta > \beta_0 > 0$, where β_0 is an unknown constant. For $|\beta|$ sufficiently small, the existence of nontrivial solutions was studied in [23] via a perturbation method, but the solutions obtained there seem not necessary to be least energy solutions. Note that Theorem 1.3 in this paper is much more general that those results in [23]. We also remark that any other results in our paper can not be found in [23].

2 Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.6

Define

$$\alpha_1(k,l) := \mu_1 k^{p-1} + \beta k^{\frac{p}{2}-1} l^{\frac{p}{2}} - 1, \quad k>0,\ l\geq 0; \tag{2.1}$$

$$\alpha_2(k,l) := \mu_2 l^{p-1} + \beta l^{\frac{p}{2}-1} k^{\frac{p}{2}} - 1, \quad l>0,\ k\geq 0; \tag{2.2}$$

$$h_1(k) := \beta^{-2/p}\left(k^{1-p/2} - \mu_1 k^{p/2}\right)^{2/p}, \quad 0<k\leq \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}; \tag{2.3}$$

$$h_2(l) := \beta^{-2/p}\left(l^{1-p/2} - \mu_2 l^{p/2}\right)^{2/p}, \quad 0<l\leq \mu_2^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}. \tag{2.4}$$

Then we have $\alpha_1(k, h_1(k)) \equiv 0$ and $\alpha_2(h_2(l), l) \equiv 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that $\beta > 0$, then equation*

$$\alpha_1(k,l) = 0, \quad \alpha_2(k,l) = 0, \quad k,l>0 \tag{2.5}$$

has a solution (k_0, l_0), which satisfies

$$\alpha_2(k, h_1(k)) < 0, \quad \forall\ 0<k<k_0, \tag{2.6}$$

that is, (k_0, l_0) satisfies (1.10). Similarly, (2.5) has a solution (k_1, l_1) that satisfies

$$\alpha_1(h_2(l), l) < 0, \quad \forall\ 0<l<l_1. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Equation $\alpha_1(k,l)=0,\ k,l>0$ imply that

$$l = h_1(k), \quad 0<k<\mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

While, $\alpha_2(k,l)=0$ implies that $\mu_2 l^{p/2} + \beta k^{p/2} = l^{1-p/2}$. Therefore, we turn to prove that

$$\mu_2 \frac{1-\mu_1 k^{p-1}}{\beta k^{p/2-1}} + \beta k^{p/2} = \left(\frac{1-\mu_1 k^{p-1}}{\beta k^{p/2-1}}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}, \quad 0<k^{p-1}<\frac{1}{\mu_1} \tag{2.8}$$

have a solution. Note that (2.8) is equivalent to

$$f(k) := \left(\frac{1}{\beta k^{p-1}} - \frac{\mu_1}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} - \frac{\mu_2}{\beta} - \frac{\beta^2-\mu_1\mu_2}{\beta} k^{p-1} = 0,\ 0<k^{p-1}<\frac{1}{\mu_1}. \tag{2.9}$$

Recall that $N \geq 5$ and $2p = 2^*$, we have $2-p>0$ and so

$$\lim_{k\to 0+} f(k) = +\infty, \quad f(\mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}) = -\frac{\beta}{\mu_1} < 0.$$

Therefore, there exists $k_0 \in (0, \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}})$ such that $f(k_0)=0$ and $f(k)>0$ for $k\in(0,k_0)$. Let $l_0 = h_1(k_0)$, then (k_0,l_0) is a solution of (2.5). Moreover, (2.6) follows directly from $f(k)>0$ for $k\in(0,k_0)$. The existence of (k_1,l_1) that satisfy (2.5) and (2.7) is similar. □

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that* $\beta \geq (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$, *then* $h_1(k) + k$ *is strictly increasing for* $k \in [0, \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}]$ *and* $h_2(l)+l$ *is strictly increasing for* $l \in [0, \mu_2^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}]$.

Proof. Since for $k > 0$

$$h_1'(k) = \frac{2}{p}\beta^{-2/p}\left(k^{1-p/2} - \mu_1 k^{p/2}\right)^{2/p-1}\left((1-p/2)k^{-p/2} - \frac{p}{2}\mu_1 k^{p/2-1}\right),$$

we see that $h_1'(k) \geq 0$ for $0 < \mu_1 k^{p-1} \leq \frac{2-p}{p}$ or $\mu_1 k^{p-1} = 1$, and $h_1'(k) < 0$ for $\frac{2-p}{p} < \mu_1 k^{p-1} < 1$. By direct computations, we deduce from $h_1''(k) = 0$, $\frac{2-p}{p} < \mu_1 k^{p-1} < 1$ that $k = (\mu_1 p)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$. Since $\beta \geq (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$, we have

$$\min_{0<k\leq\mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}} h_1'(k) = h_1'\left((\mu_1 p)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}\right) = -\beta^{-2/p}\mu_1^{2/p}(p-1)^{2/p} \geq -1,$$

and $h_1'(k) > -1$ for $0 < k \leq \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$ with $k \neq (\mu_1 p)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$. This implies that $h_1(k) + k$ is strictly increasing for $k \in [0, \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}]$. Similarly, $h_2(l) + l$ is strictly increasing for $l \in [0, \mu_2^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}]$. □

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that* $\beta \geq (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. *Let* (k_0, l_0) *be in Lemma 2.1. Then* $\max\{\mu_1(k_0+l_0)^{p-1}, \mu_2(k_0+l_0)^{p-1}\} < 1$ *and*

$$\alpha_2(k, h_1(k)) < 0,\ \forall\ 0 < k < k_0; \quad \alpha_1(h_2(l), l) < 0,\ \forall\ 0 < l < l_0. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2 we have

$$h_1(\mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}) + \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} = \mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} > h_1(k_0) + k_0 = k_0 + l_0,$$

that is, $\mu_1(k_0+l_0)^{p-1} < 1$. Similarly, $\mu_2(k_0+l_0)^{p-1} < 1$. By Lemma 2.1, to prove (2.10), it suffices to prove that $(k_0, l_0) = (k_1, l_1)$. By (2.6)-(2.7) we see that $k_1 \geq k_0, l_0 \geq l_1$. If $k_1 > k_0$, then $k_1 + h_1(k_1) > k_0 + h_1(k_0)$, that is, $h_2(l_1) + l_1 = k_1 + l_1 > k_0 + l_0 = h_2(l_0) + l_0$, and so $l_1 > l_0$, a contradiction. Therefore, $k_1 = k_0$ and $l_0 = l_1$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that* $\beta \geq (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. *Then*

$$\begin{cases} k + l \leq k_0 + l_0, \\ \alpha_1(k,l) \geq 0, \quad \alpha_2(k,l) \geq 0, \\ k, l \geq 0,\ (k,l) \neq (0,0) \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

has a unique solution (k_0, l_0).

Proof. Note that (k_0, l_0) satisfies (2.11). Let $(\tilde{k}, \tilde{l})$ be any a solution of (2.11). Without loss of generality, we assume that $\tilde{k} > 0$. If $\tilde{l} = 0$, then by $\tilde{k} \leq k_0 + l_0$ and $\alpha_1(\tilde{k}, 0) \geq 0$ we get that

$$1 \leq \mu_1 \tilde{k}^{p-1} \leq \mu_1(k_0+l_0)^{p-1},$$

which contradicts with Lemma 2.3. Therefore $\tilde{l} > 0$.

Assume by contradiction that $\tilde{k} < k_0$. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.2, by (2.4) it is easy to see that $h_2(l)$ is strictly increasing for $0 < \mu_2 l^{p-1} \le \frac{2-p}{p}$, and strictly decreasing for $\frac{2-p}{p} \le \mu_2 l^{p-1} \le 1$. Moreover, $h_2(0) = h_2(\mu_2^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}) = 0$. Since $0 < \tilde{k} < k_0 = h_2(l_0)$, there exists $0 < l_2 < l_3 < \mu_2^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$ such that $h_2(l_2) = h_2(l_3) = \tilde{k}$ and

$$\alpha_2(\tilde{k}, l) < 0 \iff h_2(l) > \tilde{k} \iff l_2 < l < l_3. \tag{2.12}$$

Since $\alpha_2(\tilde{k}, \tilde{l}) \ge 0$, we have $\tilde{l} \le l_2$ or $\tilde{l} \ge l_3$. Since $\alpha_1(\tilde{k}, \tilde{l}) \ge 0$, we have $\tilde{l} \ge h_1(\tilde{k})$. By Lemma 2.3 we have $\alpha_2(\tilde{k}, h_1(\tilde{k})) < 0$, and so $l_2 < h_1(\tilde{k}) < l_3$. These imply that

$$\tilde{l} \ge l_3. \tag{2.13}$$

On the other hand, since $l_1 := k_0 + l_0 - \tilde{k} > l_0$, we have

$$h_2(l_1) + k_0 + l_0 - \tilde{k} = h_2(l_1) + l_1 > h_2(l_0) + l_0 = k_0 + l_0,$$

that is, $h_2(l_1) > \tilde{k}$. By (2.12) we have $l_2 < l_1 < l_3$. By $\tilde{k} + \tilde{l} \le k_0 + l_0$ we have

$$\tilde{l} \le l_1 < l_3,$$

which contradicts with (2.13). Therefore, $\tilde{k} \ge k_0$. By a similar argument, we also have $\tilde{l} \ge l_0$. Therefore, $(\tilde{k}, \tilde{l}) = (k_0, l_0)$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume that $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda < 0$. By the Sobolev inequality (1.14) it is standard to see that $B > 0$. Since $\beta > 0$, by Lemma 2.1 equation (1.9) has a solution (k_0, l_0). Recall (1.7), we see that $(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.1) and

$$0 < B \le E(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega) = (k_0 + l_0)B_1. \tag{2.14}$$

Now we assume that $\beta \ge (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$, and we shall prove that $B = E(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$. Let $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a minimizing sequence for B, that is, $E(u_n, v_n) \to B$. Define

$$c_n = \left(\int_\Omega |u_n|^{2p}\, dx\right)^{1/p}, \quad d_n = \left(\int_\Omega |v_n|^{2p}\, dx\right)^{1/p}.$$

By (1.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (NB_1)^{2/N} c_n \le \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 + \lambda u_n^2) &= \int_\Omega (\mu_1 |u_n|^{2p} + \beta |u_n|^p |v_n|^p) \\ &\le \mu_1 c_n^p + \beta c_n^{p/2} d_n^{p/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (NB_1)^{2/N} d_n \le \int_\Omega (|\nabla v_n|^2 + \lambda v_n^2) &= \int_\Omega (\mu_2 |v_n|^{2p} + \beta |u_n|^p |v_n|^p) \\ &\le \mu_2 d_n^p + \beta c_n^{p/2} d_n^{p/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Since $E(u_n, v_n) = \frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega(|\nabla u_n|^2 + \lambda u_n^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2 + \lambda v_n^2)$, by (2.14) we have

$$(NB_1)^{2/N}(c_n + d_n) \le NE(u_n, v_n) \le N(k_0 + l_0)B_1 + o(1), \tag{2.17}$$

$$\mu_1 c_n^{p-1} + \beta c_n^{p/2-1} d_n^{p/2} \ge (NB_1)^{2/N}, \tag{2.18}$$

$$\mu_2 d_n^{p-1} + \beta c_n^{p/2} d_n^{p/2-1} \ge (NB_1)^{2/N}. \tag{2.19}$$

First, this means c_n, d_n are uniformly bounded. Passing to a subsequence, we assume that $c_n \to c$ and $d_n \to d$. Then by (2.15)-(2.16) we have $\mu_1 c^p + 2\beta c^{p/2} d^{p/2} + \mu_2 d^p \ge NB > 0$. Hence, without loss of generality, we assume that $c > 0$. If $d = 0$, then (2.17) implies $c \le (NB_1)^{1-2/N}(k_0 + l_0)$. By (2.18) and Lemma 2.3 we get

$$(NB_1)^{2/N} \le \mu_1 c^{p-1} \le \mu_1 (k_0 + l_0)^{p-1}(NB_1)^{2/N} < (NB_1)^{2/N},$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $c > 0$ and $d > 0$. Let $k = \frac{c}{(NB_1)^{1-2/N}}$ and $l = \frac{d}{(NB_1)^{1-2/N}}$, then by (2.17)-(2.19) we see that (k, l) satisfies (2.11). By Lemma 2.4 we see that $(k, l) = (k_0, l_0)$. It follows that $c_n \to k_0(NB_1)^{1-2/N}$ and $d_n \to l_0(NB_1)^{1-2/N}$ as $n \to +\infty$, and

$$NB = \lim_{n\to+\infty} NE(u_n, v_n) \ge \lim_{n\to+\infty}(NB_1)^{2/N}(c_n + d_n) = N(k_0 + l_0)B_1.$$

Combining this with (2.14), one has that

$$B = (k_0 + l_0)B_1 = E(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega),$$

and so $(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$ is a positive least energy solution of (1.1). $\square$

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 1.6. By the Sobolev inequality (1.14) it is standard to see that

$$A = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2\right) dx > 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Lemma 2.5. *If A (resp. B) is attained by a couple $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$ (resp. $(u, v) \in \mathcal{M}$), then this couple is a critical point of I (resp. E), provided $-\infty < \beta < 0$.*

Proof. Let $\beta < 0$. Assume that $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $A = I(u, v)$. Define

$$G_1(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + \beta |u|^p |v|^p),$$
$$G_2(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_2 |v|^{2p} + \beta |u|^p |v|^p).$$

Then there exists two Lagrange multipliers $L_1, L_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$I'(u, v) + L_1 G_1'(u, v) + L_2 G_2'(u, v) = 0.$$

This implies $< I'(u,v) + L_1 G_1'(u,v) + L_2 G_2'(u,v), (u,0) >= 0$, that is,

$$\left((2p-2)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_1|u|^{2p} - (2-p)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p\right) L_1 + L_2 p \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p = 0.$$

Similarly, $< I'(u,v) + L_1 G_1'(u,v) + L_2 G_2'(u,v), (0,v) >= 0$ implies that

$$\left((2p-2)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_2|v|^{2p} - (2-p)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p\right) L_2 + L_1 p \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p = 0.$$

Since $\beta < 0$, we see from $G_1(u,v) = G_2(u,v) = 0$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_1|u|^{2p} > -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_2|v|^{2p} > -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}&\left((2p-2)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_1|u|^{2p} - (2-p)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p\right)\\ &\quad\times\left((2p-2)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_2|v|^{2p} - (2-p)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p\right) > \left(p\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta|u|^p|v|^p\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

From this we deduce that $L_1 = L_2 = 0$ and so $I'(u,v) = 0$. Similarly, if $(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $E(u,v) = B$, then $E'(u,v) = 0$. $\square$

Proof of (1) in Theorem 1.6. This proof is similar to the proof of [17, Theorem 1.5-(1)] in case $N = 4$, but the details are more delicate. By (1.15) we see that $\omega_{\mu_i} := \mu_i^{-\frac{N-2}{4}} U_{1,0}$ satisfies equation $-\Delta u = \mu_i |u|^{2^*-2}u$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let $e_1 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and

$$(u_R(x), v_R(x)) = (\omega_{\mu_1}(x), \omega_{\mu_2}(x + Re_1)).$$

Then $v_R \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and so $v_R^p \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $R \to +\infty$. That is,

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^p v_R^p \, dx = 0.$$

Note that $\beta < 0$. Then for $R > 0$ sufficiently large, by a similar argument as that of Lemma 2.1 (or see the argument of existing $(t_\varepsilon, s_\varepsilon)$ in the proof of Lemma 3.1 below), we see that

$$\begin{cases} t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_R|^2 \, dx = t^2 \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^{2p} \, dx = t^{2p} \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^{2p} \, dx + t^p s^p \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^p v_R^p \, dx, \\ s^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v_R|^2 \, dx = s^2 \mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_R^{2p} \, dx = s^{2p} \mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_R^{2p} \, dx + t^p s^p \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^p v_R^p \, dx, \end{cases}$$

have a solution (t_R, s_R) with $t_R > 1$ and $s_R > 1$. Denote

$$D_1 := \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^{2p} \, dx = \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \omega_{\mu_1}^{2p} \, dx > 0,$$

$$D_2 := \mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_R^{2p}\,dx = \mu_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \omega_{\mu_2}^{2p}\,dx > 0,$$
$$F_R := |\beta| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_R^p v_R^p\,dx \to 0, \quad \text{as } R \to +\infty.$$

Then

$$t_R^2 D_1 = t_R^{2p} D_1 - t_R^p s_R^p F_R, \quad s_R^2 D_2 = s_R^{2p} D_2 - t_R^p s_R^p F_R. \tag{2.21}$$

Assume that, up to a subsequence, $t_R \to +\infty$ as $R \to \infty$, then by

$$t_R^{2p} D_1 - t_R^2 D_1 = s_R^{2p} D_2 - s_R^2 D_2$$

we also have $s_R \to +\infty$. Note that $2 - p < p$, we have

$$t_R^p D_1 - t_R^{2-p} D_1 \geq \frac{1}{2} t_R^p D_1, \;\; s_R^p D_2 - s_R^{2-p} D_2 \geq \frac{1}{2} s_R^p D_2, \;\text{ for } R \text{ large enough},$$

and so

$$F_R = \frac{t_R^p - t_R^{2-p}}{s_R^p} D_1 \geq \frac{t_R^p}{2 s_R^p} D_1, \quad F_R = \frac{s_R^p - s_R^{2-p}}{t_R^p} D_2 \geq \frac{s_R^p}{2 t_R^p} D_2,$$

which implies that

$$0 < \frac{1}{4} D_1 D_2 \leq F_R^2 \to 0, \quad \text{as } R \to +\infty,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, t_R and s_R are uniformly bounded. Then by (2.21) and $F_R \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$, we get that

$$\lim_{R \to +\infty} (|t_R - 1| + |s_R - 1|) = 0.$$

Note that $(t_R u_R, s_R v_R) \in \mathcal{N}$, we see from (1.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} A \leq I(t_R u_R, s_R v_R) &= \frac{1}{N} \left(t_R^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_R|^2\,dx + s_R^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v_R|^2\,dx \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \left(t_R^2 \mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} + s_R^2 \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \right) S^{N/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $R \to +\infty$, we get that $A \leq \frac{1}{N}(\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} + \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}) S^{N/2}$.

On the other hand, for any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}$, we see from $\beta < 0$ and (1.14) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2\,dx \leq \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{2p}\,dx \leq \mu_1 S^{-p} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2\,dx \right)^p,$$

and so $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2\,dx \geq \mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}$. Similarly, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2\,dx \geq \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}$. Combining these with (1.18), we get that $A \geq \frac{1}{N}(\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} + \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}) S^{N/2}$. Hence,

$$A = \frac{1}{N} \left(\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} + \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \right) S^{N/2}. \tag{2.22}$$

Now, assume that A is attained by some $(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}$, then $(|u|,|v|) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $I(|u|,|v|) = A$. By Lemma 2.5, we get that $(|u|,|v|)$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.13). By the maximum principle, we may assume that $u > 0, v > 0$ and so $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^p v^p \, dx > 0$. That is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx < \mu_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{2p} \, dx \le \mu_1 S^{-p} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^p,$$

Therefore, it is easy to see that

$$A = I(u,v) = \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \, dx > \frac{1}{N} \left(\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} + \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \right) S^{N/2},$$

which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Proof of (2-1) in Theorem 1.6 . This proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $\beta > 0$, by Lemma 2.1 equation (1.9) has a solution (k_0, l_0). Then $(\sqrt{k_0} U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0} U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.13) and

$$A \le I\left(\sqrt{k_0} U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0} U_{\varepsilon,y} \right) = \frac{1}{N} (k_0 + l_0) S^{N/2}. \tag{2.23}$$

Assume that $\beta \ge (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. Let $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be a minimizing sequence for A, that is, $I(u_n, v_n) \to A$. Define $c_n = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_n|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{1/p}$, $d_n = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_n|^{2p} \, dx \right)^{1/p}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S c_n &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_n|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_1 |u_n|^{2p} + \beta |u_n|^p |v_n|^p \, dx \le \mu_1 c_n^p + \beta c_n^{p/2} d_n^{p/2}, \\ S d_n &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v_n|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_2 |v_n|^{2p} + \beta |u_n|^p |v_n|^p \, dx \le \mu_2 d_n^p + \beta c_n^{p/2} d_n^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This means

$$\begin{gathered} S(c_n + d_n) \le N I(u_n, v_n) \le (k_0 + l_0) S^{N/2} + o(1), \\ \mu_1 c_n^{p-1} + \beta c_n^{p/2-1} d_n^{p/2} \ge S, \quad \beta c_n^{p/2} d_n^{p/2-1} + \mu_2 d_n^{p-1} \ge S. \end{gathered}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we see that $c_n \to k_0 S^{N/2-1}$ and $d_n \to l_0 S^{N/2-1}$ as $n \to +\infty$, and

$$NA = \lim_{n \to +\infty} N I(u_n, v_n) \ge \lim_{n \to +\infty} S(c_n + d_n) = (k_0 + l_0) S^{N/2}.$$

This implies that

$$A = \frac{1}{N} (k_0 + l_0) S^{N/2} = I(\sqrt{k_0} U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0} U_{\varepsilon,y}), \tag{2.24}$$

and so $(\sqrt{k_0} U_{\varepsilon,y}, \sqrt{l_0} U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is a positive least energy solution of (1.13). □

To finish the proof of Theorem 1.6, we need to show that (1.13) has a positive least energy solution for any $0 < \beta < (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. The following proof works for all $\beta > 0$. Therefore, we assume that $\beta > 0$, and define

$$A' := \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{N}'} I(u,v), \tag{2.25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}' := \Big\{(u,v) \in D \setminus \{(0,0)\},\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mu_1|u|^{2p} + 2\beta|u|^p|v|^p + \mu_2|v|^{2p}) = 0\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Note that $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{N}'$, one has that $A' \le A$. By Sobolev inequality, we have $A' > 0$. Define $B(0,R) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| < R\}$ and $H(0,R) := H_0^1(B(0,R)) \times H_0^1(B(0,R))$. Consider

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta u = \mu_1|u|^{2p-2}u + \beta|u|^{p-2}u|v|^p, & x \in B(0,R),\\ -\Delta v = \mu_2|v|^{2p-2}v + \beta|v|^{p-2}v|u|^p, & x \in B(0,R),\\ u, v \in H_0^1(B(0,R)),\end{cases} \tag{2.27}$$

and define

$$A'(R) := \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{N}'(R)} I(u,v), \tag{2.28}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}'(R) := \Bigg\{(u,v) \in H(0,R) \setminus \{(0,0)\},\ &\int_{B(0,R)} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \\ &- \int_{B(0,R)} (\mu_1|u|^{2p} + 2\beta|u|^p|v|^p + \mu_2|v|^{2p}) = 0\Bigg\}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Lemma 2.6. *$A'(R) \equiv A'$ for all $R > 0$.*

Proof. Take any $R_1 > R_2$. By $\mathcal{N}'(R_2) \subset \mathcal{N}'(R_1)$, we have $A'(R_1) \le A'(R_2)$. On the other hand, for any $(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}'(R_1)$, we define

$$(u_1(x), v_1(x)) := \left(\left(\frac{R_1}{R_2}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} u\left(\frac{R_1}{R_2}x\right),\ \left(\frac{R_1}{R_2}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}} v\left(\frac{R_1}{R_2}x\right)\right),$$

then it is standard to see that $(u_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{N}'(R_2)$, and so

$$A'(R_2) \le I(u_1, v_1) = I(u,v), \quad \forall (u,v) \in \mathcal{N}'(R_1).$$

That is, $A'(R_2) \le A'(R_1)$ and so $A'(R_1) = A'(R_2)$.

Obviously, $A' \le A'(R)$. Let $(u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{N}'$ be a minimizing sequence of A'. Moreover, we may assume that $u_n, v_n \in H_0^1(B(0,R_n))$ for some $R_n > 0$. Then $(u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{N}'(R_n)$ and

$$A' = \lim_{n\to\infty} I(u_n, v_n) \ge \lim_{n\to\infty} A'(R_n) \equiv A'(R).$$

Therefore, $A'(R) \equiv A'$ for all $R > 0$. $\square$

Let $0 \leq \varepsilon < p-1$. Consider

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_1 |u|^{2p-2-2\varepsilon} u + \beta |u|^{p-2-\varepsilon} u |v|^{p-\varepsilon}, & x \in B(0,1), \\ -\Delta v = \mu_2 |v|^{2p-2-2\varepsilon} v + \beta |v|^{p-2-\varepsilon} v |u|^{p-\varepsilon}, & x \in B(0,1), \\ u, v \in H_0^1(B(0,1)), \end{cases} \tag{2.30}$$

and define

$$A_\varepsilon := \inf_{(u,v)\in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(u,v), \tag{2.31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon(u,v) =& \frac{1}{2}\int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \\ &- \frac{1}{2p-2\varepsilon}\int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 |u|^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta |u|^{p-\varepsilon}|v|^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 |v|^{2p-2\varepsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon := \Bigg\{ &(u,v) \in H(0,1) \setminus \{(0,0)\},\ H_\varepsilon(u,v) := \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) \\ &- \int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 |u|^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta |u|^{p-\varepsilon}|v|^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 |v|^{2p-2\varepsilon}) = 0 \Bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.7. *For any $0 < \varepsilon < p-1$, there holds*

$$A_\varepsilon < \min\left\{ \inf_{(u,0)\in\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(u,0),\ \inf_{(0,v)\in\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(0,v) \right\}.$$

Proof. Fix any $0 < \varepsilon < p-1$. Recall that $2 < 2p - 2\varepsilon < 2^*$, we may let u_i be a least energy solution of

$$-\Delta u = \mu_i |u|^{2p-2-2\varepsilon} u, \quad u \in H_0^1(B(0,1)),$$

Then

$$I_\varepsilon(u_1, 0) = c_1 := \inf_{(u,0)\in\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(u,0), \quad I_\varepsilon(0,u_2) = c_2 := \inf_{(0,v)\in\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(0,v).$$

The following proof is inspired by [4]. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique $t(s) > 0$ such that $(t(s)u_1, t(s)su_2) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} t(s)^{2p-2\varepsilon-2} &= \frac{\int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_1|^2 + s^2 |\nabla u_2|^2)}{\int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 |u_1|^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta |u_1|^{p-\varepsilon} |su_2|^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 |su_2|^{2p-2\varepsilon})} \\ &= \frac{p'c_1 + s^2 p' c_2}{p'c_1 + |s|^{2p-2\varepsilon} p' c_2 + |s|^{p-\varepsilon} \int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta |u_1|^{p-\varepsilon} |u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $p' = \frac{2p-2\varepsilon}{p-1-\varepsilon}$. Note that $t(0) = 1$. Recall that $1 < p - \varepsilon < 2$, by direct computations we have

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{t'(s)}{|s|^{p-2-\varepsilon}s} = -\frac{(p-\varepsilon)\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}}{(2p-2\varepsilon-2)p'c_1},$$

that is,

$$t'(s) = -\frac{(p-\varepsilon)\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}}{(2p-2\varepsilon-2)p'c_1}|s|^{p-\varepsilon-2}s(1+o(1)), \text{ as } s \to 0,$$

and so

$$t(s) = 1 - \frac{\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}}{(2p-2\varepsilon-2)p'c_1}|s|^{p-\varepsilon}(1+o(1)), \text{ as } s \to 0.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} t(s)^{2p-2\varepsilon} &= 1 - \frac{(2p-2\varepsilon)\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}}{(2p-2\varepsilon-2)p'c_1}|s|^{p-\varepsilon}(1+o(1)) \\ &= 1 - \frac{\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}}{2c_1}|s|^{p-\varepsilon}(1+o(1)), \text{ as } s \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we see from $1/2 - 1/p' = 1/(2p-2\varepsilon) > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon &\le I_\varepsilon\left(t(s)u_1, t(s)su_2\right) \\ &= \frac{t(s)^{2p-2\varepsilon}}{p'}\left(p'c_1 + |s|^{2p-2\varepsilon}p'c_2 + |s|^{p-\varepsilon}\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= c_1 - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p'}\right)|s|^{p-\varepsilon}\int_{B(0,1)} 2\beta|u_1|^{p-\varepsilon}|u_2|^{p-\varepsilon} + o(|s|^{p-\varepsilon}) \\ &< c_1 = \inf_{(u,0)\in\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(u,0) \quad \text{as } |s| > 0 \text{ small enough,} \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, we have $A_\varepsilon < \inf_{(0,v)\in\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon} I_\varepsilon(0,v)$. □

Recall ω_{μ_i} in the proof of Theorem 1.6 -(1), by the same argument as Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A' &< \min\left\{\inf_{(u,0)\in\mathcal{N}'} I(u,0), \inf_{(0,v)\in\mathcal{N}'} I(0,v)\right\} = \min\left\{I(\omega_{\mu_1},0), I(0,\omega_{\mu_2})\right\} \\ &= \min\left\{\frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}S^{N/2}, \frac{1}{N}\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}S^{N/2}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Theorem 2.1. *For any $0 < \varepsilon < p - 1$, (2.30) has a classical least energy solution $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$, and $u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon$ are both positive radially symmetric decreasing.*

Proof. Fix any $0 < \varepsilon < p-1$, it is easy to see that $A_\varepsilon > 0$. For $(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$ with $u \ge 0, v \ge 0$, we denote by (u^*, v^*) as its Schwartz symmetrization. Then by the properties of Schwartz symmetrization and $\beta > 0$, we have

$$\int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u^*|^2 + |\nabla v^*|^2) \le \int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 |u^*|^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta |u^*|^{p-\varepsilon} |v^*|^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 |v^*|^{2p-2\varepsilon}).$$

Therefore, there exists $0 < t^* \le 1$ such that $(t^* u^*, t^* v^*) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon(t^* u^*, t^* v^*) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p-2\varepsilon}\right)(t^*)^2 \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u^*|^2 + |\nabla v^*|^2) \\ &\le \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p-2\varepsilon}\right) \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) = I_\varepsilon(u,v). \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

Therefore, we may take a minimizing sequence $(u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$ of A_ε such that $(u_n, v_n) = (u_n^*, v_n^*)$ and $I_\varepsilon(u_n, v_n) \to A_\varepsilon$. We see from (2.33) that u_n, v_n are uniformly bounded in $H_0^1(B(0,1))$. Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup u_\varepsilon, v_n \rightharpoonup v_\varepsilon$ weakly in $H_0^1(B(0,1))$. By the compactness of the embedding $H_0^1(B(0,1)) \hookrightarrow L^{2p-2\varepsilon}(B(0,1))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 |u_\varepsilon|^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta |u_\varepsilon|^{p-\varepsilon} |v_\varepsilon|^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 |v_\varepsilon|^{2p-2\varepsilon}) \\ =& \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 |u_n|^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta |u_n|^{p-\varepsilon} |v_n|^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 |v_n|^{2p-2\varepsilon}) \\ =& \frac{2p-2\varepsilon}{p-1-\varepsilon} \lim_{n\to\infty} I_\varepsilon(u_n, v_n) = \frac{2p-2\varepsilon}{p-1-\varepsilon} A_\varepsilon > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) \ne (0,0)$. Moreover, $u_\varepsilon \ge 0, v_\varepsilon \ge 0$ are radially symmetric. Meanwhile, $\int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2)$, so

$$\int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) \le \int_{B(0,1)} (\mu_1 u_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta u_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon} v_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon}).$$

Therefore, there exists $0 < t_\varepsilon \le 1$ such that $(t_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon \le I_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p-2\varepsilon}\right)(t_\varepsilon)^2 \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) \\ &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p-2\varepsilon}\right) \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} I_\varepsilon(u_n, v_n) = A_\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $t_\varepsilon = 1$ and $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$ with $I(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = A_\varepsilon$. Moreover,

$$\int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_n|^2 + |\nabla v_n|^2),$$

that is, $u_n \to u_\varepsilon$ and $v_n \to v_\varepsilon$ strongly in $H_0^1(B(0,1))$. There exists a Lagrange multiplier $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$I'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) - \gamma H'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = 0.$$

Since $I'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = H_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = 0$ and

$$H'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = (2+2\varepsilon-2p)\int_{B(0,1)}(\mu_1 u_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon} + 2\beta u_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon} v_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon} + \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon}) < 0,$$

we get that $\gamma = 0$ and so $I'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = 0$. By Lemma 2.7, we see that $u_\varepsilon \not\equiv 0$ and $v_\varepsilon \not\equiv 0$. This means that $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ is a least energy solution of (2.28). Recall that $u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \geq 0$ are radially symmetric non-increasing. By regularity theory and the maximum principle, we see that $u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon > 0$ in $B(0,1)$, $u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon \in C^2(B(0,1))$ and are radially symmetric decreasing. $\square$

Completion of the proof of (2) in Theorem 1.6 . Recall (2.29), for any $(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}'(1)$, there exists $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(t_\varepsilon u, t_\varepsilon v) \in \mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$ with $t_\varepsilon \to 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} A_\varepsilon \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon u, t_\varepsilon v) = I(u,v), \ \ \forall (u,v) \in \mathcal{N}'(1).$$

By Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} A_\varepsilon \leq A'(1) = A'. \tag{2.34}$$

By Theorem 2.1, let $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ be a positive least energy solution of (2.30), which is radially symmetric decreasing. By $I'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = 0$ and Sobolev inequality, it is easily seen that

$$\frac{2p-2\varepsilon}{p-\varepsilon-1} A_\varepsilon = \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2) \geq C_0, \quad \forall\, 0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{p-1}{2}, \tag{2.35}$$

where C_0 is a positive constant independent of ε. Then $u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon$ are uniformly bounded in $H_0^1(B(0,1))$. Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ and $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v_0$ weakly in $H_0^1(B(0,1))$. Then (u_0, v_0) is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu_1 |u|^{2p-2}u + \beta |u|^{p-2}u|v|^p, & x \in B(0,1), \\ -\Delta v = \mu_2 |v|^{2p-2}v + \beta |v|^{p-2}v|u|^p, & x \in B(0,1), \\ u, v \in H_0^1(B(0,1)). \end{cases} \tag{2.36}$$

Assume by contradiction that $\|u_\varepsilon\|_\infty + \|v_\varepsilon\|_\infty$ is uniformly bounded, then by the Dominated Convergent Theorem, we get that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{B(0,1)} u_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon} = \int_{B(0,1)} u_0^{2p}, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{B(0,1)} v_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon} = \int_{B(0,1)} v_0^{2p},$$
$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{B(0,1)} u_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon} v_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon} = \int_{B(0,1)} u_0^p v_0^p.$$

Combining these with $I'_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) = I'(u_0, v_0) = 0$, it is standard to show that $u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ and $v_\varepsilon \to v_0$ strongly in $H_0^1(B(0,1))$. Then by (2.35), we see that $(u_0, v_0) \neq (0,0)$. Moreover, $u_0 \geq 0, v_0 \geq 0$. We may assume that $u_0 \not\equiv 0$. By the strong maximum principle, $u_0 > 0$ in $B(0,1)$. Note that $2p = 2^*$. Combining these with Pohozaev identity, we have

$$0 < \int_{\partial B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_0|^2 + |\nabla v_0|^2)(x \cdot \nu)\, d\sigma = 0,$$

a contradiction. Here, ν denotes the outward unit normal vector on $\partial B(0,1)$. Therefore, $\|u_\varepsilon\|_\infty + \|v_\varepsilon\|_\infty \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We will use a blowup analysis. Note that $u_\varepsilon(0) = \max\limits_{B(0,1)} u_\varepsilon(x)$ and $v_\varepsilon(0) = \max\limits_{B(0,1)} v_\varepsilon(x)$, we define $K_\varepsilon := max\{u_\varepsilon(0), v_\varepsilon(0)\}$, then $K_\varepsilon \to +\infty$. Define

$$U_\varepsilon(x) = K_\varepsilon^{-1} u_\varepsilon(K_\varepsilon^{-\alpha_\varepsilon} x), \quad V_\varepsilon(x) = K_\varepsilon^{-1} v_\varepsilon(K_\varepsilon^{-\alpha_\varepsilon} x), \quad \alpha_\varepsilon = p - 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Then

$$1 = \max\{U_\varepsilon(0), V_\varepsilon(0)\} = \max\left\{ \max_{x \in B(0, K_\varepsilon^{\alpha_\varepsilon})} U_\varepsilon(x), \max_{x \in B(0, K_\varepsilon^{\alpha_\varepsilon})} V_\varepsilon(x) \right\} \tag{2.37}$$

and $U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta U_\varepsilon = \mu_1 U_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon-1} + \beta U_\varepsilon^{p-1-\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon}, & x \in B(0, K_\varepsilon^{\alpha_\varepsilon}), \\ -\Delta V_\varepsilon = \mu_2 V_\varepsilon^{2p-2\varepsilon-1} + \beta V_\varepsilon^{p-1-\varepsilon} U_\varepsilon^{p-\varepsilon}, & x \in B(0, K_\varepsilon^{\alpha_\varepsilon}). \end{cases}$$

Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2\, dx = K_\varepsilon^{-(N-2)\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\, dx,$$

we see that $\{(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \times D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) = D$. By elliptic estimates, for a subsequence we have $(U_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon) \to (U, V) \in D$ uniformly in every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, and (U, V) satisfies (1.13), that is $I'(U, V) = 0$. Moreover, $U \geq 0, V \geq 0$ are radially symmetric non-increasing. By (2.37) we have $(U, V) \neq (0, 0)$, and so $(U, V) \in \mathcal{N}'$. Then we deduce from (2.34) that

$$\begin{aligned} A' \leq I(U, V) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla U|^2 + |\nabla V|^2)\, dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p - 2\varepsilon}\right) \int_{B(0, K_\varepsilon^{\alpha_\varepsilon})} (|\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla V_\varepsilon|^2)\, dx \\ &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2p - 2\varepsilon}\right) \int_{B(0,1)} (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2)\, dx \\ &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} A_\varepsilon \leq A'. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $I(U, V) = A'$. By (2.32) we have that $U \not\equiv 0$ and $V \not\equiv 0$. By the strong maximum principle, $U > 0$ and $V > 0$ are radially symmetric decreasing. We also have $(U, V) \in \mathcal{N}$, and so $I(U, V) \geq A \geq A'$, that is,

$$I(U, V) = A = A', \tag{2.38}$$

and (U,V) is a positive least energy solution of (1.13), which is radially symmetric decreasing.

Finally, we show the existence of $(k(\beta),l(\beta))$ for $\beta>0$ small. Recall (2.1)-(2.2), We denote $\alpha_i(k,l)$ by $\alpha_i(k,l,\beta)$ here. Define $k(0)=\mu_1^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$ and $l(0)=\mu_2^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$, then $\alpha_i(k(0),l(0),0)=0, i=1,2$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_k\alpha_1(k(0),l(0),0)&=(p-1)\mu_1k(0)^{p-2}>0,\\ \partial_l\alpha_2(k(0),l(0),0)&=(p-1)\mu_2l(0)^{p-2}>0,\\ \partial_l\alpha_1(k(0),l(0),0)&=\partial_k\alpha_2(k(0),l(0),0)=0,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\det\begin{pmatrix}\partial_k\alpha_1(k(0),l(0),0) & \partial_l\alpha_1(k(0),l(0),0)\\ \partial_k\alpha_2(k(0),l(0),0) & \partial_l\alpha_2(k(0),l(0),0)\end{pmatrix}>0.$$

Therefore, by the implicit function theorem, $k(\beta),l(\beta)$ are well defined and class C^1 on $(-\beta_2,\beta_2)$ for some $\beta_2>0$, and $\alpha_i(k(\beta),l(\beta),\beta)\equiv 0, i=1,2$. This implies that $(\sqrt{k(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y},\sqrt{l(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is a positive solution of (1.13). Note that $2p=2^*$, This implies that

$$\lim_{\beta\to 0}\Big(k(\beta)+l(\beta)\Big)=k(0)+l(0)=\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}+\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}},$$

that is, there exists $0<\beta_1\le\beta_2$, such that

$$k(\beta)+l(\beta)>\min\Big\{\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}},\quad \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\Big\},\quad \forall\ \beta\in(0,\beta_1).$$

Combining this with (2.23) and (2.32), we have

$$I(U,V)=A'=A<I(\sqrt{k(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y},\sqrt{l(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y}),\quad \forall\ \beta\in(0,\beta_1),$$

that is, $(\sqrt{k(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y},\sqrt{l(\beta)}U_{\varepsilon,y})$ is different positive solution of (1.13) with respect to (U,V). This completes the proof. $\square$

Before ending this section, we need to study the following properties of (U,V) obtained in Theorem 1.6.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $\beta>0$. Let (U,V) be a positive radially symmetric least energy solution of (1.13) obtained in Thoerem 1.6. Then there exists $C>0$ such that*

$$U(x)+V(x)\le C(1+|x|)^{2-N},\quad |\nabla U(x)|+|\nabla V(x)|\le C(1+|x|)^{1-N}.$$

Proof. Define the Kelvin transformation:

$$U^*(x):=|x|^{2-N}U\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right),\quad V^*(x):=|x|^{2-N}V\left(\frac{x}{|x|^2}\right).$$

Then $U^*, V^* \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and (U^*, V^*) satisfies the same system (1.13). Then by a standard Brezis-Kato type argument ([8]), we see that $U^*, V^* \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$U(x) + V(x) \le C|x|^{2-N}. \tag{2.39}$$

On the other hand, note that U, V are radially symmetric decreasing. We also have $U, V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and so

$$U(x) + V(x) \le C(1 + |x|)^{2-N}.$$

Moreover, standard elliptic regularity theory implies that $U, V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. We write $U(|x|) = U(x)$ for convenience. Then

$$(r^{N-1}U_r)_r = -r^{N-1}(\mu_1 U^{2^*-1} + \beta U^{2^*/2-1}V^{2^*/2}),$$

and so for any $R \ge 1$, we see from (2.39) that

$$\begin{aligned} R^{N-1}|U_r(R)| &\le |U_r(1)| + \int_1^R r^{N-1}(\mu_1 U^{2^*-1} + \beta U^{2^*/2-1}V^{2^*/2})\, dr \\ &\le C + C\int_1^{+\infty} r^{N-1} r^{-N-2}\, dr \le C. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is easy to see that $|\nabla U(x)| \le C(1 + |x|)^{1-N}$ for some $C > 0$. Similarly, $|\nabla V(x)| \le C(1 + |x|)^{1-N}$. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section, we assume that $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 < 0$. Recall the definition of B in (1.5), since

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_i u^2) \ge \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_1(\Omega)}\right) \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

it is standard to see that $B > 0$. As has been pointed out in Section 1, by [9] the Brezis-Nirenberg problem (1.3)

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_i u = \mu_i |u|^{2^*-2}u, \qquad u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

has a positive least energy solution $u_{\mu_i} \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ with energy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) + \lambda_i}{\lambda_1(\Omega)}\right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \mu_i^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} \le B_{\mu_i} &:= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_{\mu_i}|^2 + \lambda_i u_{\mu_i}^2) - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega \mu_i u_{\mu_i}^{2^*} \\ &< \frac{1}{N}\mu_i^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

The following lemma is very important. In the proof we need the assumption $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\beta < 0$, then*

$$B < \min\left\{B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}S^{N/2},\ B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}S^{N/2},\ A\right\}.$$

Proof. The idea of this proof comes from [17], but some details are more delicate. Let $\beta < 0$. Let $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{N}{2}B_{\mu_1}t^2 - \frac{N}{4p}B_{\mu_1}t^{2p} + \frac{1}{N}(\mu_1/2)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}S^{N/2} < 0, \quad \forall\ t > t_0. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $u_{\mu_1} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $u_{\mu_1} \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, there exists

$$B(y_0, 2R) := \{x : |x - y_0| \le 2R\} \subset \Omega,$$

such that

$$\delta := \max_{B(y_0,2R)} u_{\mu_1} \le \min\left\{\left(\frac{\mu_2}{2|\beta|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}},\ \left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_1(\Omega)}{2|\beta|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\psi \in C_0^1(B(y_0, 2R))$ be a function with $0 \le \psi \le 1$ and $\psi \equiv 1$ for $|x - y_0| \le R$. Define $v_\varepsilon = \psi U_{\varepsilon,y_0}$, where U_{ε,y_0} is defined in (1.15) and (1.16). Then by [9] or [38, Lemma 1.46], we have the following inequalities

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 = S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}), \quad \int_\Omega |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*} = S^{N/2} + O(\varepsilon^N), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\int_\Omega |v_\varepsilon|^2 \ge C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}). \tag{3.5}$$

Moreover, since $N \ge 5$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{N-2}}\,dx &\le \int_{B(y_0,2R)} U_{\varepsilon,y_0}^{\frac{N}{N-2}}\,dx = C\int_{B(0,2R)}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 + |x|^2}\right)^{N/2}dx \\ &\le C\varepsilon^{N/2}\left(\ln\frac{2R}{\varepsilon} + 1\right) = o(\varepsilon^2).\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Since $supp(v_\varepsilon) \subset B(y_0, 2R)$, by (3.3) we have for $t, s > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}2|\beta|t^p s^p \int_\Omega u_{\mu_1}^p v_\varepsilon^p &\le 2|\beta|\delta^{p-1}t^p s^p \int_\Omega u_{\mu_1} v_\varepsilon^p \\ &\le |\beta|\delta^{p-1}t^{2p}\int_\Omega u_{\mu_1}^2 + |\beta|\delta^{p-1}s^{2p}\int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^{2p} \\ &\le \frac{|\beta|\delta^{p-1}}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_1(\Omega)}t^{2p}\int_\Omega(|\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2 + \lambda_1 u_{\mu_1}^2) + |\beta|\delta^{p-1}s^{2p}\int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^{2p} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}t^{2p}\int_\Omega \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p} + \frac{1}{2}s^{2p}\int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p},\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon) &= \frac{1}{2}t^2\int_\Omega(|\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2+\lambda_1 u_{\mu_1}^2)+\frac{1}{2}s^2\int_\Omega(|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2+\lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2)\\
&\quad-\frac{1}{2p}\int_\Omega(t^{2p}\mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p}+2t^p s^p\beta u_{\mu_1}^p v_\varepsilon^p+s^{2p}\mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p})\\
&\le \frac{1}{2}t^2\int_\Omega(|\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2+\lambda_1 u_{\mu_1}^2)-\frac{1}{4p}t^{2p}\int_\Omega \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}s^2\int_\Omega(|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2+\lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2)-\frac{1}{2p}s^{2p}\frac{\mu_2}{2}\int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^{2p}\\
&= f(t)+g(s). \qquad (3.8)
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.4)-(3.5), it is standard to check that (cf. [9, 38])

$$\max_{s>0} g(s) < \frac{1}{N}(\mu_2/2)^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}S^{N/2} \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \text{ small enough.} \qquad (3.9)$$

By (3.1) we see that

$$f(t)=\frac{N}{2}B_{\mu_1}t^2-\frac{N}{4p}B_{\mu_1}t^{2p}.$$

Combining these with (3.2), we get that

$$f(t)+g(s)<0, \quad \forall\, t>t_0,\ s>0,$$

and so it follows from (3.8) that

$$\max_{t,s>0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon)=\max_{0<t\le t_0, s>0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon).$$

Define

$$g_\varepsilon(s):=\frac{1}{2}s^2\int_\Omega(|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2+\lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2)\,dx-\frac{s^{2p}}{2p}\int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p}\,dx, \quad s>0.$$

Then there exists a unique $s(\varepsilon)>0$, such that $g_\varepsilon'(s(\varepsilon))=0$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
s(\varepsilon)^{2p-2} &= \frac{\int_\Omega(|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2+\lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2)\,dx}{\int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p}\,dx} \ge \left(1+\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1(\Omega)}\right)\frac{\int_\Omega|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2\,dx}{\mu_2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}U_{\varepsilon,y_0}^{2p}\,dx}\\
&= \left(1+\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1(\Omega)}\right)\frac{S^{N/2}+O(\varepsilon^{N-2})}{\mu_2 S^{N/2}}\\
&\ge \frac{1}{2\mu_2}\left(1+\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1(\Omega)}\right)=: s_0^{2p-2}, \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \text{ small enough.}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since g_ε is increasing for $0<s\le s(\varepsilon)$, for any $0<s<s_0$, we have $g_\varepsilon(s)<g_\varepsilon(s_0)$ and so $E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon)<E(tu_{\mu_1}, s_0 v_\varepsilon)$. That is,

$$\max_{t,s>0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon)=\max_{0<t\le t_0, s\ge s_0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon). \qquad (3.10)$$

For $0 < t \le t_0, s \ge s_0$, we see from (3.6) that

$$|\beta| t^p s^p \int_\Omega u_{\mu_1}^p v_\varepsilon^p \le |\beta| t_0^p \delta^p s_0^{p-2} s^2 \int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^p \le C s^2 \cdot o(\varepsilon^2),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon) &= \frac{1}{2} t^2 \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2 + \lambda_1 u_{\mu_1}^2) + \frac{1}{2} s^2 \int_\Omega (|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 + \lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2p} \int_\Omega (t^{2p} \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p} + 2 t^p s^p \beta u_{\mu_1}^p v_\varepsilon^p + s^{2p} \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p}) \\
&\le \frac{1}{2} t^2 \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2 + \lambda_1 u_{\mu_1}^2) - \frac{1}{2p} t^{2p} \int_\Omega \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} s^2 \left(\int_\Omega (|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 + \lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2) + o(\varepsilon^2) \right) - \frac{1}{2p} s^{2p} \mu_2 \int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^{2p} \\
&=: f_1(t) + g_1(s). \qquad (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\max_{t>0} f_1(t) = f_1(1) = B_{\mu_1}$. By (3.4)-(3.5) and $\lambda_2 < 0$, it is easy to show that

$$\max_{s>0} g_1(s) < \frac{1}{N} \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \text{ small enough.}$$

Combining these with (3.10) and (3.11), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{t,s>0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon) &= \max_{0<t\le t_0, s\ge s_0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon) \\
&\le \max_{t>0} f_1(t) + \max_{s>0} g_1(s) \\
&< B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N} \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \text{ small enough.} \qquad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we claim that there exists $t_\varepsilon, s_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(t_\varepsilon u_{\mu_1}, s_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}$. Similarly as (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_\Omega \beta u_{\mu_1}^p v_\varepsilon^p \, dx \right)^2 &\le |\beta|^2 \delta^{2p-2} \left(\int_\Omega u_{\mu_1} v_\varepsilon^p \, dx \right)^2 \\
&\le |\beta|^2 \delta^{2p-2} \int_\Omega u_{\mu_1}^2 \, dx \int_\Omega v_\varepsilon^{2p} \, dx \\
&\le \frac{|\beta|^2 \delta^{2p-2}}{(\lambda_1(\Omega) + \lambda_1) \mu_2} \int_\Omega \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p} \, dx \int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p} \, dx \\
&< \int_\Omega \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p} \, dx \int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p} \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

For convenience we denote

$$D_1 = \int_\Omega \mu_1 u_{\mu_1}^{2p} \, dx, \quad D_2 = \int_\Omega \beta u_{\mu_1}^p v_\varepsilon^p \, dx,$$

$$D_3 = \int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p} \, dx, \quad D_4 = \int_\Omega (|\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 + \lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2) \, dx.$$

Then $D_2 < 0$ and $D_1 D_3 - D_2^2 > 0$. Furthermore, $(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}$ for some $t, s > 0$ is equivalent to

$$t^{2-p} D_1 = t^p D_1 + s^p D_2, \quad s^{2-p} D_4 = s^p D_3 + t^p D_2, \quad s, t > 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Note that $1 < p = \frac{N}{N-2} < 2$, by $s^p = (t^{2-p} - t^p) D_1 / D_2 > 0$ we have $t > 1$. Therefore, (3.13) is equivalent to

$$f_3(t) := D_4 \left(\frac{D_1}{|D_2|} (1 - t^{2-2p}) \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} - \frac{D_1 D_3 - D_2^2}{|D_2|} t^{2p-2} + \frac{D_1 D_3}{|D_2|}, \ t > 1. \tag{3.14}$$

Since $f_3(1) > 0$ and $\lim\limits_{t \to +\infty} f_3(t) < 0$, (3.14) has a solution $t > 1$. Therefore, (3.13) has a solution $t_\varepsilon > 0, s_\varepsilon > 0$. That is, $(t_\varepsilon u_{\mu_1}, s_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}$ and from (3.12) we get

$$B \le E(t_\varepsilon u_{\mu_1}, s_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon) \le \max_{t,s>0} E(tu_{\mu_1}, sv_\varepsilon) < B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N} \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}.$$

By a similar argument, we can also prove that $B < B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N} \mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}$. By (2.22) and (3.1), we have

$$A > \max \left\{ B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N} \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}, \ B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N} \mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} \right\},$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $\beta < 0$, then there exists $C_2 > C_1 > 0$, such that for any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{M}$ with $E(u, v) \le A$, there holds*

$$C_1 \le \int_\Omega |u|^{2p} \, dx, \int_\Omega |v|^{2p} \, dx \le C_2.$$

Proof. This follows directly from

$$\frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) + \lambda_1}{\lambda_1(\Omega)} S \left(\int_\Omega |u|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \le \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 u^2) \le \mu_1 \int_\Omega |u|^{2p},$$
$$\frac{\lambda_1(\Omega) + \lambda_2}{\lambda_1(\Omega)} S \left(\int_\Omega |v|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \le \int_\Omega (|\nabla v|^2 + \lambda_2 v^2) \le \mu_1 \int_\Omega |v|^{2p},$$

$E(u, v) \le A$ and (1.5). $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $u_n \rightharpoonup u, v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$, then passing to a subsequence, there holds*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_\Omega (|u_n|^p |v_n|^p - |u_n - u|^p |v_n - v|^p - |u|^p |v|^p) \, dx = 0.$$

Proof. Note that $2p = 2^*$, we have

$$u_n \to u, \ v_n \to v \quad \text{strongly in } L^q(\Omega), \ \forall\, 0 < q < 2p,$$
$$u_n \rightharpoonup u, \ v_n \rightharpoonup v \quad \text{weakly in } L^{2p}(\Omega).$$

Fix any $t \in [0,1]$. First, we claim that

$$|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p \rightharpoonup (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^{p-2}u|v|^p \text{ weakly in } L^{\frac{2p}{2p-1}}(\Omega). \tag{3.15}$$

Since the map $h : L^{q_1}(\Omega) \to L^{q_1/q_2}(\Omega)$ with $h(s) = |s|^{q_2-1}s$ is continuous, we have

$$|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu) \to (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^{p-2}u \text{ strongly in } L^q(\Omega), \ \forall\, 0 < q < \tfrac{2p}{p-1},$$
$$|v_n|^p \to |v|^p \text{ strongly in } L^q(\Omega), \ \forall\, 0 < q < 2.$$

Then for any $1 \le q < \frac{2p}{2p-1}$, by Hölder inequality, we have

$$|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p - |u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v|^p \to 0 \text{ strongly in } L^q(\Omega),$$
$$|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v|^p - (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^{p-2}u|v|^p \to 0 \text{ strongly in } L^q(\Omega),$$

and so for any $1 \le q < \frac{2p}{2p-1}$,

$$|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p \to (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^{p-2}u|v|^p \quad \text{strongly in } L^q(\Omega).$$

Since $|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\frac{2p}{2p-1}}(\Omega)$, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $|u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p \rightharpoonup w$ weakly in $L^{\frac{2p}{2p-1}}(\Omega)$. Then for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we have

$$\int_\Omega w\varphi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega |u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p\varphi = \int_\Omega (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^{p-2}u|v|^p\varphi,$$

which implies that $w = (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^{p-2}u|v|^p$, that is, (3.15) holds. Similarly, we can show that

$$|u_n - u|^p|v_n - tv|^{p-2}(v_n - tv) \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ weakly in } L^{\frac{2p}{2p-1}}(\Omega). \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore, by (3.15)-(3.16), Fubini Theorem and the Dominated Convergent Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \left(|u_n|^p|v_n|^p - |u_n - u|^p|v_n - v|^p\right) dx \\
=& -\int_\Omega \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}\left(|u_n - tu|^p|v_n|^p + |u_n - u|^p|v_n - tv|^p\right) dt\, dx \\
=& p\int_\Omega \int_0^1 |u_n - tu|^{p-2}(u_n - tu)|v_n|^p u \, dt\, dx \\
&+ p\int_\Omega \int_0^1 |u_n - u|^p|v_n - tv|^{p-2}(v_n - tv)v \, dt\, dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
=&p\int_0^1\int_\Omega |u_n-tu|^{p-2}(u_n-tu)|v_n|^p u\,dx\,dt\\
&+p\int_0^1\int_\Omega |u_n-u|^p|v_n-tv|^{p-2}(v_n-tv)v\,dx\,dt\\
\to&p\int_0^1\int_\Omega (1-t)^{p-1}|u|^p|v|^p\,dx\,dt=\int_\Omega |u|^p|v|^p\,dx,\ \text{ as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta<0$**.** The main idea of the proof is similar to the proof of [17, Theorem 1.3-(1)] in case $N=4$, but as we will see, some new ideas are needed. Assume that $\beta<0$. Note that E is coercive and bounded from below on $\mathcal{M}$. Then by the Ekeland variational priciple (cf. [31]), there exists a minimizing sequence $\{(u_n,v_n)\}\subset\mathcal{M}$ satisfying

$$
E(u_n,v_n)\le\min\left\{B+\frac{1}{n},\ A\right\},\tag{3.17}
$$

$$
E(u,v)\ge E(u_n,v_n)-\frac{1}{n}\|(u_n,v_n)-(u,v)\|,\quad\forall(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}.\tag{3.18}
$$

Here, $\|(u,v)\|:=(\int_\Omega(|\nabla u|^2+|\nabla v|^2)\,dx)^{1/2}$ is the norm of H. Then $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ is bounded in H. For any $(\varphi,\phi)\in H$ with $\|\varphi\|,\|\phi\|\le1$ and each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, we define the functions h_n and $g_n:\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
h_n(t,s,l)=&\int_\Omega|\nabla(u_n+t\varphi+su_n)|^2+\lambda_1\int_\Omega|u_n+t\varphi+su_n|^2\\
&-\mu_1\int_\Omega|u_n+t\varphi+su_n|^{2p}-\beta\int_\Omega|u_n+t\varphi+su_n|^p|v_n+t\phi+lv_n|^p,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_n(t,s,l)=&\int_\Omega|\nabla(v_n+t\phi+lv_n)|^2+\lambda_2\int_\Omega|v_n+t\phi+lv_n|^2\\
&-\mu_2\int_\Omega|v_n+t\phi+lv_n|^{2p}-\beta\int_\Omega|u_n+t\varphi+su_n|^p|v_n+t\phi+lv_n|^p.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}
$$

Let $\mathbf{0}=(0,0,0)$. Then $h_n,g_n\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R})$ and $h_n(\mathbf{0})=g_n(\mathbf{0})=0$. Furthermore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial h_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0})&=-(2p-2)\mu_1\int_\Omega|u_n|^{2p}-(p-2)\beta\int_\Omega|u_n|^p|v_n|^p,\\
\frac{\partial h_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0})&=\frac{\partial g_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0})=-p\beta\int_\Omega|u_n|^p|v_n|^p\,dx,\\
\frac{\partial g_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0})&=-(2p-2)\mu_2\int_\Omega|v_n|^{2p}-(p-2)\beta\int_\Omega|u_n|^p|v_n|^p.
\end{aligned}
$$

Define the matrix

$$
F_n:=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{\partial h_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0}) & \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0})\\ \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0}) & \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0})\end{pmatrix}.
$$

Since $\beta < 0$ and $(u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1 \int_\Omega |u_n|^{2p} &= \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 + \lambda_1 u_n^2) + |\beta| \int_\Omega |u_n|^p |v_n|^p,\\ \mu_2 \int_\Omega |v_n|^{2p} &= \int_\Omega (|\nabla v_n|^2 + \lambda_2 v_n^2) + |\beta| \int_\Omega |u_n|^p |v_n|^p,\end{aligned}$$

and it follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\det(F_n) &\geq (2p-2)^2 \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 + \lambda_1 |u_n|^2) \int_\Omega (|\nabla v_n|^2 + \lambda_2 |v_n|^2)\\ &\geq CS^2 \left(\int_\Omega |u_n|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_\Omega |v_n|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq C > 0, \qquad (3.21)\end{aligned}$$

where C is independent of n. By the implicit function theorem, functions $s_n(t)$ and $l_n(t)$ are well defined and class C^1 on some interval $(-\delta_n, +\delta_n)$ for $\delta_n > 0$. Moreover, $s_n(0) = l_n(0) = 0$ and

$$h_n(t, s_n(t), l_n(t)) \equiv 0, \quad g_n(t, s_n(t), l_n(t)) \equiv 0, \quad t \in (-\delta, +\delta).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{cases} s_n'(0) = \frac{1}{\det(F_n)} \left(\frac{\partial g_n}{\partial t}(\mathbf{0}) \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0}) - \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0}) \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial t}(\mathbf{0}) \right), \\ l_n'(0) = \frac{1}{\det(F_n)} \left(\frac{\partial g_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0}) \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial t}(\mathbf{0}) - \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial t}(\mathbf{0}) \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0}) \right). \end{cases}$$

While, since $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is bounded in H, it is easy to see that $|\frac{\partial h_n}{\partial t}(\mathbf{0})|, |\frac{\partial g_n}{\partial t}(\mathbf{0})| \leq C$, where C is independent of n. From Lemma 3.2 we also have

$$\left| \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0}) \right|, \quad \left| \frac{\partial h_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0}) \right|, \quad \left| \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial s}(\mathbf{0}) \right|, \quad \left| \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial l}(\mathbf{0}) \right| \leq C.$$

Hence, combining these we have

$$|s_n'(0)|, \quad |l_n'(0)| \leq C, \qquad (3.22)$$

where C is independent of n.

Define $\varphi_{n,t} := u_n + t\varphi + s_n(t) u_n$ and $\phi_{n,t} := v_n + t\phi + l_n(t) v_n$, then $(\varphi_{n,t}, \phi_{n,t}) \in \mathcal{M}$ for $t \in (-\delta_n, \delta_n)$. It follows from (3.18) that

$$E(\varphi_{n,t}, \phi_{n,t}) - E(u_n, v_n) \geq -\frac{1}{n} \left\| (t\varphi + s_n(t) u_n, t\phi + l_n(t) v_n) \right\|. \qquad (3.23)$$

Note that $E'(u_n, v_n)(u_n, 0) = E'(u_n, v_n)(0, v_n) = 0$. By Taylor Expansion we have

$$\begin{aligned}E(\varphi_{n,t}, \phi_{n,t}) - E(u_n, v_n) &= E'(u_n, v_n)\left(t\varphi + s_n(t) u_n, t\phi + l_n(t) v_n\right) + r(n,t)\\ &= tE'(u_n, v_n)(\varphi, \phi) + r(n,t), \qquad (3.24)\end{aligned}$$

where $r(n,t) = o(\|(t\varphi + s_n(t)u_n, t\phi + l_n(t)v_n)\|)$ as $t \to 0$. By (3.22) we see that

$$\limsup_{t\to 0} \left\| \left(\varphi + \frac{s_n(t)}{t} u_n, \phi + \frac{l_n(t)}{t} v_n \right) \right\| \le C, \tag{3.25}$$

where C is independent of n. Hence, $r(n,t) = o(t)$. By (3.23), (3.24), (3.25) and letting $t \to 0$, we get that

$$|E'(u_n, v_n)(\varphi, \phi)| \le \frac{C}{n},$$

where C is independent of n. Thus,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} E'(u_n, v_n) = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

Since $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is bounded in H, we may assume that $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$ weakly in H. Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\begin{gathered} u_n \rightharpoonup u, \quad v_n \rightharpoonup v, \quad \text{weakly in } L^{2p}(\Omega), \\ |u_n|^{q-1}u_n \rightharpoonup |u|^{q-1}u, \quad |v_n|^{q-1}v_n \rightharpoonup |v|^{q-1}v, \ \text{weakly in } L^{2p/q}(\Omega),\ 1 < q < 2p, \\ u_n \to u, \quad v_n \to v, \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega). \end{gathered}$$

Thus, by (3.26) we have $E'(u,v) = 0$. Set $\omega_n = u_n - u$ and $\sigma_n = v_n - v$. Then by Brezis-Lieb Lemma (cf. [38]), there holds

$$|u_n|_{2p}^{2p} = |u|_{2p}^{2p} + |\omega_n|_{2p}^{2p} + o(1), \quad |v_n|_{2p}^{2p} = |v|_{2p}^{2p} + |\sigma_n|_{2p}^{2p} + o(1). \tag{3.27}$$

Note that $(u_n, v_n) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $E'(u,v) = 0$. Combining these with (3.27), Lemma 3.3, we get that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \omega_n|^2 - \int_\Omega (\mu_1 |\omega_n|^{2p} + \beta |\omega_n|^p |\sigma_n|^p) = o(1), \tag{3.28}$$

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma_n|^2 - \int_\Omega (\mu_2 |\sigma_n|^{2p} + \beta |\omega_n|^p |\sigma_n|^p) = o(1), \tag{3.29}$$

$$E(u_n, v_n) = E(u,v) + I(\omega_n, \sigma_n) + o(1). \tag{3.30}$$

Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla \omega_n|^2 = b_1, \quad \lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma_n|^2 = b_2.$$

Then by (3.28) and (3.29) we have $I(\omega_n, \sigma_n) = \frac{1}{N}(b_1 + b_2) + o(1)$. Letting $n \to +\infty$ in (3.30), we get that

$$0 \le E(u,v) \le E(u,v) + \frac{1}{N}(b_1 + b_2) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} E(u_n, v_n) = B. \tag{3.31}$$

Case 1. $u \equiv 0, v \equiv 0$.

By Lemma 3.2, (3.27) and (3.31), we have $0 < b_1 < +\infty$ and $0 < b_2 < +\infty$, and we may assume that both $\omega_n \not\equiv 0$ and $\sigma_n \not\equiv 0$ for n large. Then by (3.28) and (3.29) we have

$$\int_\Omega \mu_1 |\omega_n|^{2p} \int_\Omega \mu_2 |\sigma_n|^{2p} - \left(\beta \int_\Omega |\omega_n|^p |\sigma_n|^p \right)^2 > 0, \quad \text{for } n \text{ large}.$$

Then by a similar argument as that in the proof of Lemma 3.1, for n large, there exists $t_n, s_n > 0$ such that $(t_n\omega_n, s_n\sigma_n) \in \mathcal{N}$. Up to a subsequence, we claim that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} (|t_n - 1| + |s_n - 1|) = 0. \tag{3.32}$$

This conclusion is obvious in case $N = 4$ and $p = 2$ (see [17]), but it is not trivial in our general case $N \geq 5$ here. Denote

$$\begin{gathered} B_{n,1} = \int_\Omega |\nabla \omega_n|^2 \to b_1, \;\; B_{n,2} = \int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma_n|^2 \to b_2, \\ C_{n,1} = \int_\Omega \mu_1 |\omega_n|^{2p}, \;\; C_{n,2} = \int_\Omega \mu_2 |\sigma_n|^{2p}, \\ D_n = |\beta| \int_\Omega |\omega_n|^p |\sigma_n|^p. \end{gathered}$$

Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $C_{n,1} \to c_1 < +\infty$, $C_{n,2} \to c_2 < +\infty$ and $D_n \to d < +\infty$. By (3.28)-(3.29) we have

$$c_1 = b_1 + d \geq b_1 > 0, \quad c_2 = b_2 + d \geq b_2 > 0, \tag{3.33}$$

$$t_n^2 B_{n,1} = t_n^{2p} C_{n,1} - t_n^p s_n^p D_n, \quad s_n^2 B_{n,2} = s_n^{2p} C_{n,2} - t_n^p s_n^p D_n. \tag{3.34}$$

This implies that

$$t_n^{2p-2} \geq \frac{B_{n,1}}{C_{n,1}} \to \frac{b_1}{c_1} > 0, \quad s_n^{2p-2} \geq \frac{B_{n,2}}{C_{n,2}} \to \frac{b_2}{c_2} > 0. \tag{3.35}$$

Assume that, up to a subsequence, $t_n \to +\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, then by

$$t_n^{2p} C_{n,1} - t_n^2 B_{n,1} = s_n^{2p} C_{n,2} - s_n^2 B_{n,2},$$

we also have $s_n \to +\infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} D_n^2 &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{t_n^p C_{n,1} - t_n^{2-p} B_{n,1}}{s_n^p} \cdot \frac{s_n^p C_{n,2} - s_n^{2-p} B_{n,2}}{t_n^p} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} (C_{n,1} - t_n^{2-2p} B_{n,1})(C_{n,2} - s_n^{2-2p} B_{n,2}) \\ &= c_1 c_2 = (b_1 + d)(b_2 + d) > d^2, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Therefore, t_n, s_n are uniformly bounded. Passing to a subsequence, by (3.35) we may assume that $t_n \to t_\infty \geq (b_1/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2p-2}} > 0$ and $s_n \to s_\infty \geq (b_2/c_2)^{\frac{1}{2p-2}} > 0$. Then we see from (3.34) that

$$s_\infty^p d = t_\infty^p c_1 - t_\infty^{2-p} b_1, \quad t_\infty^p d = s_\infty^p c_2 - s_\infty^{2-p} b_2.$$

If $d = 0$, then $c_i = b_i$, and so $t_\infty = s_\infty = 1$. That is, (3.32) holds. Now we consider the case $d > 0$. Define $f(t) = t^p c_1 - t^{2-p} b_1$, then for $t \geq (b_1/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2p-2}}$, we have

$$f'(t) = pc_1 t^{p-1} - (2-p)b_1 t^{1-p} > (2-p)t^{1-p}(c_1 t^{2p-2} - b_1) \geq 0,$$

that is, f is increasing with respect to $t \geq (b_1/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2p-2}}$. If $t_\infty < 1$, then

$$s_\infty^p d = f(t_\infty) < f(1) = c_1 - b_1 = d,$$

that is, $s_\infty < 1$, and we see from (3.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 &= \frac{t_\infty^p c_1 - t_\infty^{2-p} b_1}{s_\infty^p} \cdot \frac{s_\infty^p c_2 - s_\infty^{2-p} b_2}{t_\infty^p} = (c_1 - t_\infty^{2-2p} b_1)(c_2 - s_\infty^{2-2p} b_2) \\ &= (d + b_1 - t_\infty^{2-2p} b_1)(d + b_2 - s_\infty^{2-2p} b_2) < d^2, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. If $t_\infty > 1$, since $1 \geq (b_1/c_1)^{\frac{1}{2p-2}}$, we have

$$s_\infty^p d = f(t_\infty) > f(1) = c_1 - b_1 = d,$$

that is, $s_\infty > 1$, and so

$$d^2 = (d + b_1 - t_\infty^{2-2p} b_1)(d + b_2 - s_\infty^{2-2p} b_2) > d^2,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $t_\infty = s_\infty = 1$ and (3.32) holds. This implies that

$$\frac{1}{N}(b_1 + b_2) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} I(\omega_n, \sigma_n) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} I(t_n\omega_n, s_n\sigma_n) \geq A.$$

Combining this with (3.31) we get that $B \geq A$, a contradiction with Lemma 3.1. Therefore, Case 1 is impossible.

Case 2. $u \not\equiv 0, v \equiv 0$ or $u \equiv 0, v \not\equiv 0$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u \not\equiv 0, v \equiv 0$. Then $b_2 > 0$. By Case 1 we may assume that $b_1 = 0$. Then $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_\Omega |\omega_n|^p |\sigma_n|^p = 0$, and so

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma_n|^2 = \int_\Omega \mu_2 |\sigma_n|^{2p} + o(1) \leq \mu_2 S^{-p} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla \sigma_n|^2 \right)^p + o(1).$$

This implies that $b_2 \geq \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}$. Note that u is a nontrivial solution of $-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2} u$, we have from (3.1) that $E(u, 0) \geq B_{\mu_1}$. By (3.31) we get that

$$B \geq B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N} b_2 \geq B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N} \mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2},$$

a contradiction with Lemma 3.1. Therefore, Case 2 is impossible.

Since Cases 1 and 2 are both impossible, we have that $u \not\equiv 0, v \not\equiv 0$, that is, $(u,v) \in \mathcal{M}$. By (3.31) we have $E(u,v) = B$. Then $(|u|,|v|) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $E(|u|,|v|) = B$. By Lemma 2.5, $(|u|,|v|)$ is a solution of (1.1). Then, using the maximum principle, we see that $|u|,|v| > 0$ in Ω. Therefore, $(|u|,|v|)$ is a positive least energy solution of (1.1). This completes the proof. □

It remains to prove Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta > 0$. Assume that $\beta > 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{B} := \inf_{h\in\Gamma} \max_{t\in[0,1]} E(h(t)), \tag{3.36}$$

where $\Gamma = \{h \in C([0,1],H) : h(0) = (0,0), E(h(1)) < 0\}$. By (1.4), we see that for any $(u,v) \in H$, $(u,v) \neq (0,0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{t>0} E(tu,tv) &= E(t_{u,v}u, t_{u,v}v)\\ &= \frac{1}{N} t_{u,v}^2 \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 u^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + \lambda_2 v^2)\\ &= \frac{1}{N} t_{u,v}^{2^*} \int_\Omega (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + 2\beta |u|^p |v|^p + \mu_2 |v|^{2p}),\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

where $t_{u,v} > 0$ satisfies

$$t_{u,v}^{2p-2} = \frac{\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 u^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + \lambda_2 v^2)}{\int_\Omega (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + 2\beta |u|^p |v|^p + \mu_2 |v|^{2p})}. \tag{3.38}$$

Note that $(t_{u,v}u, t_{u,v}v) \in \mathcal{M}'$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}' := \Big\{(u,v) \in H \setminus \{(0,0)\},\ G(u,v) &:= \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 u^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + \lambda_2 v^2)\\ &- \int_\Omega (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + 2\beta |u|^p |v|^p + \mu_2 |v|^{2p}) = 0\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

it is easy to check that

$$\mathcal{B} = \inf_{H\ni(u,v)\neq(0,0)} \max_{t>0} E(tu,tv) = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{M}'} E(u,v). \tag{3.40}$$

Note that $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}'$, one has that $\mathcal{B} \leq B$. Similarly as (2.20), we have $\mathcal{B} > 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\beta > 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{B} < \min\{B_{\mu_1},\ B_{\mu_2},\ A\}.$$

Proof. Step 1. We prove that $\mathcal{B} < A$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 \in \Omega$. Then there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $B(0,2\rho) := \{x : |x| \leq 2\rho\} \subset \Omega$. Let $\psi \in C_0^1(B(0,2\rho))$ be a nonnegative function with $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ and $\psi \equiv 1$ for $|x| \leq \rho$. Recall that (U,V) in Theorem 1.6. we define

$$(U_\varepsilon(x), V_\varepsilon(x)) := \left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} U\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right),\ \varepsilon^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} V\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U|^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U_\varepsilon|^{2^*} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U|^{2^*},\\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla V_\varepsilon|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla V|^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |V_\varepsilon|^{2^*} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |V|^{2^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) := (\psi U_\varepsilon, \psi V_\varepsilon). \tag{3.41}$$

First we claim the following inequalities

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U|^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}), \tag{3.42}$$

$$\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*} \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U|^{2^*} + O(\varepsilon^N), \tag{3.43}$$

$$\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{\frac{2^*}{2}} |v_\varepsilon|^{\frac{2^*}{2}} \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U|^{\frac{2^*}{2}} |V|^{\frac{2^*}{2}} + O(\varepsilon^N), \tag{3.44}$$

$$\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^2 \ge C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}), \tag{3.45}$$

where C is a positive constant.

Let $0 < \varepsilon \ll \rho$. By Proposition 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |\nabla\psi|^2 |U_\varepsilon|^2\,dx &\le C \int_{\rho\le|x|\le 2\rho} \varepsilon^{2-N} U^2(x/\varepsilon)\,dx\\ &\le C\varepsilon^2 \int_{\rho/\varepsilon\le|x|\le 2\rho/\varepsilon} U^2(x)\,dx\\ &\le C\varepsilon^2 \int_{\rho/\varepsilon\le|x|\le 2\rho/\varepsilon} |x|^{4-2N}\,dx = O(\varepsilon^{N-2}),\end{aligned}$$

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 |\psi|^2\,dx \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U|^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega \psi U_\varepsilon \nabla\psi \nabla U_\varepsilon\right| &\le C \int_{\rho\le|x|\le 2\rho} |\nabla U_\varepsilon||U_\varepsilon|\,dx\\ &\le C \int_{\rho\le|x|\le 2\rho} \varepsilon^{1-N} |\nabla_x U(x/\varepsilon)||U(x/\varepsilon)|\,dx\\ &= C\varepsilon \int_{\rho/\varepsilon\le|x|\le 2\rho/\varepsilon} |\nabla U(x)||U(x)|\,dx\\ &\le C\varepsilon \int_{\rho/\varepsilon\le|x|\le 2\rho/\varepsilon} |x|^{3-2N}\,dx = O(\varepsilon^{N-2}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2\,dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U_\varepsilon|^2|\psi|^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla\psi|^2|U_\varepsilon|^2 + 2\int_\Omega \psi U_\varepsilon \nabla\psi\nabla U_\varepsilon\\ &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U|^2\,dx + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}),\end{aligned}$$

that is, (3.42) holds. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(1-\psi^{2^*})|U_\varepsilon|^{2^*}\,dx \le \int_{|x|\ge\rho} \varepsilon^{-N}|U(x/\varepsilon)|^{2^*}\,dx &= \int_{|x|\ge\rho/\varepsilon} |U(x)|^{2^*}\,dx\\ \le C\int_{|x|\ge\rho/\varepsilon} |x|^{-2N}\,dx &= O(\varepsilon^N),\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{2^*}\,dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U_\varepsilon|^{2^*}\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(1-\psi^{2^*})|U_\varepsilon|^{2^*}\,dx\\ &\ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U|^{2^*}\,dx + O(\varepsilon^N),\end{aligned}$$

that is, (3.43) holds. Similarly, (3.44) holds. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^2\,dx &\ge \int_{|x|\le\rho} \varepsilon^{2-N}|U(x/\varepsilon)|^2\,dx\\ &= \varepsilon^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U^2\,dx - \varepsilon^2\int_{|x|\ge\rho/\varepsilon} U^2(x)\,dx\\ &\ge C\varepsilon^2 - C\varepsilon^2\int_{|x|\ge\rho/\varepsilon} |x|^{4-2N}\,dx = C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}),\end{aligned}$$

that is, (3.45) holds. Similarly, we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla V|^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}), \tag{3.46}$$

$$\int_\Omega |v_\varepsilon|^{2^*} \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |V|^{2^*} + O(\varepsilon^N), \tag{3.47}$$

$$\int_\Omega |v_\varepsilon|^2 \ge C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2}). \tag{3.48}$$

Recall that $I(U,V) = A$, we have

$$NA = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla U|^2 + |\nabla V|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu_1 U^{2^*} + 2\beta U^{\frac{2^*}{2}} V^{\frac{2^*}{2}} + \mu_2 V^{2^*}.$$

Combining this with (3.42)-(3.48) and recalling that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 < 0, 2p = 2^*, N \ge 5$, we have for any $t > 0$ that

$$E(tu_\varepsilon, tv_\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2}t^2\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 + \lambda_1 u_\varepsilon^2 + |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 + \lambda_2 v_\varepsilon^2)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{2p}t^{2p}\int_\Omega (\mu_1 u_\varepsilon^{2p} + 2\beta u_\varepsilon^p v_\varepsilon^p + \mu_2 v_\varepsilon^{2p})\\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\left(|\nabla U|^2 + |\nabla V|^2\right) - C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2})\right)t^2\\
&\quad -\frac{1}{2^*}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\left(\mu_1 U^{2^*} + 2\beta U^{\frac{2^*}{2}}V^{\frac{2^*}{2}} + \mu_2 V^{2^*}\right) + O(\varepsilon^N)\right)t^{2^*}\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(NA - C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2})\right)t^2 - \frac{1}{2^*}\left(NA + O(\varepsilon^N)\right)t^{2^*}\\
&\le \frac{1}{N}\Big(NA - C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2})\Big)\left(\frac{NA - C\varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^{N-2})}{NA + O(\varepsilon^N)}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}\\
&< A \quad \text{for } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ small enough.}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.49}
$$

Hence, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there holds

$$
\mathcal{B} \le \max_{t>0} E(tu_\varepsilon, tv_\varepsilon) < A. \tag{3.50}
$$

Step 2. we shall prove that $\mathcal{B} < B_{\mu_1}$. This proof is similar to Lemma 2.7. Recall (3.1) and (3.38), we define $t(s) := t_{u_{\mu_1}, su_{\mu_2}}$, that is,

$$
t(s)^{2p-2} = \frac{NB_{\mu_1} + s^2 NB_{\mu_2}}{NB_{\mu_1} + |s|^{2p}NB_{\mu_2} + |s|^p\int_\Omega 2\beta|u_{\mu_1}|^p|u_{\mu_2}|^p}.
$$

Note that $t(0) = 1$. Recall that $1 < p = \frac{N}{N-2} < 2$, by direct computations we get that

$$
\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{t'(s)}{|s|^{p-2}s} = -\frac{p\int_\Omega 2\beta|u_{\mu_1}|^p|u_{\mu_2}|^p}{(2p-2)NB_{\mu_1}},
$$

that is,

$$
t'(s) = -\frac{p\int_\Omega 2\beta|u_{\mu_1}|^p|u_{\mu_2}|^p}{(2p-2)NB_{\mu_1}}|s|^{p-2}s(1+o(1)), \text{ as } s\to 0,
$$

and so

$$
t(s) = 1 - \frac{\int_\Omega 2\beta|u_{\mu_1}|^p|u_{\mu_2}|^p}{(2p-2)NB_{\mu_1}}|s|^p(1+o(1)), \text{ as } s\to 0.
$$

This implies that

$$
t(s)^{2p} = 1 - \frac{2p\int_\Omega 2\beta|u_{\mu_1}|^p|u_{\mu_2}|^p}{(2p-2)NB_{\mu_1}}|s|^p(1+o(1)), \text{ as } s\to 0.
$$

Therefore, we deduce from (3.37) and $\frac{2p}{2p-2} = N/2$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} &\le E\left(t(s)u_{\mu_1}, t(s)su_{\mu_2}\right)\\
&= \frac{t(s)^{2p}}{N}\left(NB_{\mu_1} + |s|^{2p}NB_{\mu_2} + |s|^p\int_\Omega 2\beta|u_{\mu_1}|^p|u_{\mu_2}|^p\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= B_{\mu_1} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{N}\right)|s|^p \int_\Omega 2\beta |u_{\mu_1}|^p |u_{\mu_2}|^p + o(|s|^p)$$
$$< B_{\mu_1} \quad \text{as } |s| > 0 \text{ small enough,}$$

that is, $\mathcal{B} < B_{\mu_1}$. By a similar argument, we can prove that $\mathcal{B} < B_{\mu_2}$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta > 0$**.** Assume that $\beta > 0$. Since the functional E has a mountain pass structure, by the mountain pass theorem (cf. [5, 38]) there exists $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset H$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} E(u_n, v_n) = \mathcal{B}, \quad \lim_{n\to+\infty} E'(u_n, v_n) = 0.$$

It is standard to see that $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is bounded in H, and so we may assume that $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u, v)$ weakly in H. Set $\omega_n = u_n - u$ and $\sigma_n = v_n - v$ and use the same symbols as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta < 0$, we see that $E'(u, v) = 0$ and (3.28)-(3.30) also hold. Moreover,

$$0 \le E(u, v) \le E(u, v) + \frac{1}{N}(b_1 + b_2) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} E(u_n, v_n) = \mathcal{B}. \tag{3.51}$$

Case 1. $u \equiv 0, v \equiv 0$.

By (3.51), we have $b_1 + b_2 > 0$. Then we may assume that $(\omega_n, \sigma_n) \neq (0, 0)$ for n large. Recall $\mathcal{N}'$ in (2.26), by (3.28)-(3.29), it is easy to check that there exists $t_n > 0$ such that $(t_n\omega_n, t_n\sigma_n) \in \mathcal{N}'$ and $t_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Then by (2.38) and (3.51) we have

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{N}(b_1 + b_2) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} I(\omega_n, \sigma_n) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} I(t_n\omega_n, t_n\sigma_n) \ge A' = A,$$

a contradiction with Lemma 3.4. Therefore, Case 1 is impossible.

Case 2. $u \not\equiv 0, v \equiv 0$ or $u \equiv 0, v \not\equiv 0$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u \not\equiv 0, v \equiv 0$. Then u is a nontrivial solution of $-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2}u$, and so $\mathcal{B} \ge E(u, 0) \ge B_{\mu_1}$, a contradiction with Lemma 3.4. Therefore, Case 2 is also impossible.

Since Cases 1 and 2 are both impossible, we have that $u \not\equiv 0, v \not\equiv 0$. Since $E'(u, v) = 0$, we have $(u, v) \in \mathcal{M}$. By $\mathcal{B} \le B$ and (3.51) we have $E(u, v) = \mathcal{B} = B$. This means $(|u|, |v|) \in \mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}'$ and $E(|u|, |v|) = \mathcal{B} = B$. By (3.39) and (3.40), there exists a Lagrange multiplier $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$E'(|u|, |v|) - \gamma G'(|u|, |v|) = 0.$$

Since $E'(|u|, |v|)(|u|, |v|) = G(|u|, |v|) = 0$ and

$$G'(|u|, |v|)(|u|, |v|) = -(2p - 2)\int_\Omega (\mu_1 |u|^{2p} + 2\beta |u|^p |v|^p + \mu_2 |v|^{2p}) \neq 0,$$

we get that $\gamma = 0$ and so $E'(|u|, |v|) = 0$. This means that $(|u|, |v|)$ is a least energy solution of (1.1). By the maximum principle, we see that $|u|, |v| > 0$ in Ω. Therefore, $(|u|, |v|)$ is a positive least energy solution of (1.1). This completes the proof. □

4 Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.7

In this section, we assume that $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda < 0$ and $\beta \geq (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. Define $g : [(p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\},\ +\infty)$ by

$$g(\beta) := (p-1)\mu_1\mu_2\beta^{2/p-2} + \beta^{2/p}. \tag{4.1}$$

Then

$$g'(\beta) = \frac{2}{p}\beta^{2/p-3}\Big(\beta^2 - (p-1)^2\mu_1\mu_2\Big) > 0, \quad \forall\, \beta > (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}.$$

By direct computations, we have

$$g\Big((p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}\Big) \leq p(p-1)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}\max\left\{\mu_1^{2/p},\ \mu_2^{2/p}\right\}.$$

Therefore, there exists a unique $\beta_0 \geq (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ such that

$$g(\beta_0) = p(p-1)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}\max\left\{\mu_1^{2/p},\ \mu_2^{2/p}\right\}, \quad \text{and} \tag{4.2}$$

$$g(\beta) > p(p-1)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}\max\left\{\mu_1^{2/p},\ \mu_2^{2/p}\right\}, \quad \forall\, \beta > \beta_0. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover,

$$\beta_0 = (p-1)\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}, \quad \text{if } \mu_1 = \mu_2. \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that $\beta > \beta_0$, where β_0 is defined in (4.2). Let (k_0, l_0) be in Lemma 2.1. Then*

$$p\mu_1 k_0^{p-1} < 1, \quad p\mu_2 l_0^{p-1} < 1.$$

Proof. Let $k_1 = (p\mu_1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$, then by (2.3) we have

$$l_1 := h_1(k_1) = \left[\frac{p-1}{p\beta(p\mu_1)^{\frac{2-p}{2(p-1)}}}\right]^{2/p}.$$

By (4.3) and direct computations, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_2(k_1, l_1) &= \mu_2 l_1^{p-1} + \beta k_1^{p/2} l_1^{p/2-1} - 1\\ &= \frac{1}{l_1}\left[\mu_2 l_1^p + k_1(1 - \mu_1 k_1^{p-1})\right] - 1\\ &= \frac{1}{l_1}\left[\mu_2 l_1^p + \frac{p-1}{p}k_1\right] - 1\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \left[\frac{p\beta(p\mu_1)^{\frac{2-p}{2(p-1)}}}{p-1}\right]^{\frac{2}{p}} \left\{\mu_2\left[\frac{p-1}{p\beta(p\mu_1)^{\frac{2-p}{2(p-1)}}}\right]^2 + \frac{p-1}{p}(p\mu_1)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}\right\} - 1\\
&= (p-1)^{1-2/p}p^{-1}\mu_1^{-2/p}g(\beta) - 1 > 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.3 we have $k_1 > k_0$, that is, $p\mu_1 k_0^{p-1} < 1$. Similarly, let $l_2 = (p\mu_2)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$, then

$$\alpha_1(h_2(l_2), l_2) = (p-1)^{1-2/p}p^{-1}\mu_2^{-2/p}g(\beta) - 1 > 0.$$

By Lemma 2.3 again, we have $l_2 > l_0$, and so $p\mu_2 l_0^{p-1} < 1$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $\beta > \beta_0$, where β_0 is defined in (4.2). Recall α_1, α_2 defined in (2.1)-(2.2), and (k_0, l_0) obtained in Lemma 2.1. Then*

$$F(k_0, l_0) := \det\begin{pmatrix} \partial_k\alpha_1(k_0,l_0) & \partial_l\alpha_1(k_0,l_0)\\ \partial_k\alpha_2(k_0,l_0) & \partial_l\alpha_2(k_0,l_0)\end{pmatrix} < 0.$$

Proof. By $\alpha_1(k_0,l_0) = \alpha_2(k_0,l_0) = 0$ we have

$$\beta k_0^{p/2-2}l_0^{p/2} = k_0^{-1} - \mu_1 k_0^{p-2}, \quad \beta l_0^{p/2-2}k_0^{p/2} = l_0^{-1} - \mu_2 l_0^{p-2}.$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_k\alpha_1(k_0,l_0) &= (p-1)\mu_1 k_0^{p-2} + (p/2-1)\beta k_0^{p/2-2}l_0^{p/2}\\
&= \frac{p}{2}\mu_1 k_0^{p-2} - (1-p/2)k_0^{-1};\\
\partial_l\alpha_2(k_0,l_0) &= (p-1)\mu_2 l_0^{p-2} + (p/2-1)\beta l_0^{p/2-2}k_0^{p/2}\\
&= \frac{p}{2}\mu_2 l_0^{p-2} - (1-p/2)l_0^{-1};\\
\partial_l\alpha_1(k_0,l_0) &= \partial_k\alpha_2(k_0,l_0) = \frac{p}{2}\beta k_0^{p/2-1}l_0^{p/2-1}\\
&= \frac{p}{2}\sqrt{(k_0^{-1} - \mu_1 k_0^{p-2})(l_0^{-1} - \mu_2 l_0^{p-2})}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(k_0,l_0) = &\left[\frac{p}{2}\mu_1 k_0^{p-2} - (1-p/2)k_0^{-1}\right]\left[\frac{p}{2}\mu_2 l_0^{p-2} - (1-p/2)l_0^{-1}\right]\\
&- \frac{p^2}{4}\Big(k_0^{-1} - \mu_1 k_0^{p-2}\Big)\Big(l_0^{-1} - \mu_2 l_0^{p-2}\Big)\\
=&\frac{p}{2}(p-1)k_0^{-1}l_0^{-1}\left(\mu_1 k_0^{p-1} + \mu_2 l_0^{p-1} - \frac{2}{p}\right) < 0
\end{aligned}
$$

from Lemma 4.1. □

Lemma 4.3. *Fix any $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ and $\beta > \beta_0$. Let (u_0, v_0) be a least energy solution of (1.1) with (μ_1, μ_2, β) which exists by Theorem 1.3. Recall $(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$ in Theorem 1.1. Then*

$$\int_\Omega |u_0|^{2p}\,dx = k_0^p \int_\Omega \omega^{2p}\,dx. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. Fix any $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ and $\beta > \beta_0$. We remark from (4.1)-(4.2) that $\beta_0(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \beta_0$ is completely determined by μ_1, μ_2. Then there exists $0 < \varepsilon < \mu_1$ such that for any $\mu \in (\mu_1 - \varepsilon, \mu_1 + \varepsilon)$, we also have $\beta > \beta_0(\mu, \mu_2)$. Then by Lemmas 2.1, 4.2 and the implicit function theorem, when μ_1 is replaced by μ, functions $k_0(\mu)$ and $l_0(\mu)$ are well defined and class C^1 for $\mu \in (\mu_1 - \varepsilon_1, \mu_1 + \varepsilon_1)$ for some $0 < \varepsilon_1 \le \varepsilon$. Recall the definition of $E, \mathcal{M}$ and B, they all depend on μ, and we use notations $E_\mu, \mathcal{M}_\mu, B(\mu)$ in this proof, when μ_1 is replaced by μ. Then $B(\mu) = (k_0(\mu) + l_0(\mu))B_1 \in C^1((\mu_1 - \varepsilon_1, \mu_1 + \varepsilon_1), \mathbb{R})$. In particular, $B'(\mu_1) := \frac{d}{d\mu} B(\mu_1)$ exists. Note that $B = \mathcal{B}$ by the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the case $\beta > 0$. Then by (3.40) we have

$$B(\mu) = \inf_{H \ni (u,v) \ne (0,0)} \max_{t>0} E_\mu(tu, tv).$$

Denote

$$C = \int_\Omega (|\nabla u_0|^2 + \lambda_1 u_0^2 + |\nabla v_0|^2 + \lambda_2 v_0^2),$$

$$D = \int_\Omega (2\beta |u_0|^p |v_0|^p + \mu_2 |v_0|^{2p}), \quad G = \int_\Omega |u_0|^{2p}\,dx.$$

There exists $t(\mu) > 0$ such that

$$\max_{t>0} E_\mu(tu_0, tv_0) = E_\mu\Big(t(\mu)u_0, t(\mu)v_0\Big),$$

where $t(\mu) > 0$ satisfies $f(\mu, t(\mu)) = 0$, and

$$f(\mu, t) := t^{2p-2}(\mu G + D) - C.$$

Note that $f(\mu_1, 1) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(\mu_1, 1) = (2p-2)(\mu_1 G + D) > 0$, and $f(\mu, t(\mu)) \equiv 0$. By the implicit function theorem, there exists $0 < \varepsilon_2 \le \varepsilon_1$, such that $t(\mu) \in C^\infty((\mu_1 - \varepsilon_2, \mu_1 + \varepsilon_2), \mathbb{R})$. By $f(\mu, t(\mu)) \equiv 0$ we see that

$$t'(\mu_1) = -\frac{G}{(2p-2)(\mu_1 G + D)}.$$

By Taylor expansion, we see that $t(\mu) = 1 + t'(\mu_1)(\mu - \mu_1) + O((\mu - \mu_1)^2)$, and so

$$t^2(\mu) = 1 + 2t'(\mu_1)(\mu - \mu_1) + O((\mu - \mu_1)^2).$$

Note that $C = \mu_1 G + D = NB(\mu_1)$. Then by (3.37) that

$$B(\mu) \le E_\mu(t(\mu)u_0, t(\mu)v_0) = \frac{1}{N} t^2(\mu) C = t^2(\mu) B(\mu_1)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= B(\mu_1) - \frac{2GB(\mu_1)}{(2p-2)(\mu_1 G + D)}(\mu-\mu_1) + O((\mu-\mu_1)^2)\\
&= B(\mu_1) - \frac{G}{2p}(\mu-\mu_1) + O((\mu-\mu_1)^2),
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that $\dfrac{B(\mu)-B(\mu_1)}{\mu-\mu_1} \geq -\dfrac{G}{2p} + O((\mu-\mu_1))$, as $\mu \nearrow \mu_1$, and so $B'(\mu_1) \geq -\frac{G}{2p}$. Similarly, we have

$$
\frac{B(\mu)-B(\mu_1)}{\mu-\mu_1} \leq -\frac{G}{2p} + O((\mu-\mu_1)), \quad \text{as } \mu \searrow \mu_1,
$$

that is, $B'(\mu_1) \leq -\frac{G}{2p}$. Hence, $B'(\mu_1) = -\dfrac{G}{2p} = -\dfrac{1}{2p}\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u_0|^{2p}\,dx$. By Theorem 1.1, $(\sqrt{k_0}\omega, \sqrt{l_0}\omega)$ is also a positive least energy solution of (1.1). Therefore, $B'(\mu_1) = -\dfrac{k_0^p}{2p}\displaystyle\int_\Omega \omega^{2p}\,dx$, that is, (4.5) holds. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let (u, v) be any a positive least energy solution of (1.1). By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$
\int_\Omega |u|^{2p}\,dx = k_0^p \int_\Omega \omega^{2p}\,dx.
$$

By a similar proof of Lemma 4.3, that is, by computing $B'(\mu_2)$ and $B'(\beta)$ respectively, we can show that

$$
\int_\Omega |v|^{2p}\,dx = l_0^p \int_\Omega \omega^{2p}\,dx, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_\Omega |u|^p|v|^p\,dx = k_0^{p/2} l_0^{p/2} \int_\Omega \omega^{2p}\,dx.
$$

Therefore,

$$
\int_\Omega |u|^p|v|^p\,dx = l_0^{p/2}k_0^{-p/2}\int_\Omega |u|^{2p}\,dx, \quad \int_\Omega |u|^p|v|^p\,dx = l_0^{-p/2}k_0^{p/2}\int_\Omega |v|^{2p}\,dx. \tag{4.6}
$$

Define $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) := (\frac{1}{\sqrt{k_0}}u, \frac{1}{\sqrt{l_0}}v)$. By $\alpha_1(k_0, l_0) = \alpha_2(k_0, l_0) = 0$ and (4.6) we get

$$
\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 + \lambda \tilde{u}^2\,dx = \int_\Omega |\tilde{u}|^{2p}\,dx, \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 + \lambda \tilde{v}^2\,dx = \int_\Omega |\tilde{v}|^{2p}\,dx. \tag{4.7}
$$

Then by (1.8) we have

$$
\frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2 + \lambda \tilde{u}^2\,dx \geq B_1, \quad \frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{v}|^2 + \lambda \tilde{v}^2\,dx \geq B_1,
$$

and so

$$
B = (k_0 + l_0)B_1 = \frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 u^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + \lambda_2 v^2)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{N}k_0 \int_\Omega (|\nabla\tilde u|^2 + \lambda_1\tilde u^2) + \frac{1}{N}l_0 \int_\Omega (|\nabla\tilde v|^2 + \lambda_1\tilde v^2)\\
&\ge (k_0 + l_0)B_1.
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that

$$\frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega |\nabla\tilde u|^2 + \lambda\tilde u^2\,dx = B_1, \quad \frac{1}{N}\int_\Omega |\nabla\tilde v|^2 + \lambda\tilde v^2\,dx = B_1.$$

Combining this with (4.7), we see from [9] that $\tilde u$ and $\tilde v$ are both postive least energy solutions of (1.6). Then we see from (u, v) satisfies (1.1) that

$$-\Delta\tilde u + \lambda\tilde u = \mu_1 k_0^{p-1}\tilde u^{2p-1} + \beta k_0^{p/2-1} l_0^{p/2}\tilde u^{p-1}\tilde v^p = \tilde u^{2p-1},$$

that is, $\tilde u^{p-1}\tilde v^p = \tilde u^{2p-1}$ and so $\tilde u = \tilde v$. Denote $U = \tilde u$, then $(u, v) = (\sqrt{k_0}U, \sqrt{l_0}U)$, where U is a positive least energy solution of (1.6).

Now we assume that Ω is a ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$, then the positive least energy solution of the Brezis-Nirenberg problem (1.6) is unique (cf. [6]). Therefore, the positive least energy solution of (1.1) is unique. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The proof is the same as that of Theorem 1.2. $\square$

5 Proof of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5. Recall the definition of $E, \mathcal{M}$ and B, they both depend on β, and we use notations $E_\beta, \mathcal{M}_\beta, B_\beta$ in this section. Define $B(x_0, R) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x - x_0| < R\}$. Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_2 u = \mu_2 u^{2^*-1} \ \text{ in } B(0,R),\\ u > 0 \ \text{ in } B(0,R), \quad u = 0 \ \text{ on } \partial B(0,R), \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

and the corresponding functional is $J_R : H_0^1(B(0,R)) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$J_R(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{B(0,R)} (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_2 u^2)\,dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\mu_2 \int_{B(0,R)} |u|^{2^*}\,dx. \tag{5.2}$$

We need the following energy estimates from the authors' paper [16].

Theorem 5.1. *(see [16]) Let $N \ge 5$. Then there exists $R_0 > 0$ and $C_1, C_2 > 0$, such that for any $0 < R < R_0$, there exists a least energy solution U_R of (5.1) and*

$$\frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} - C_1 R^{\frac{2N-4}{N-4}} \le J_R(U_R) \le \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} - C_2 R^{\frac{2N-4}{N-4}}. \tag{5.3}$$

With the help of Theorem 5.1, we have the following lemma, which improves Lemma 3.1 in case $N \ge 6$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $N \geq 6$. Then*

$$\sup_{\beta<0} B_\beta < \min\left\{ B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2},\ B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $N \geq 6$. For any $R > 0$ small, we take $x_R \in \Omega$ with $\operatorname{dist}(x_R, \partial\Omega) = 3R$. Then

$$|u_{\mu_1}(x)| \leq CR, \quad x \in B(x_R, 3R). \tag{5.4}$$

Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0,2))$ with $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ and $\psi \equiv 1$ in $B(0,1)$. Define $\varphi_R(x) := 1 - \psi(\frac{x-x_R}{R})$, then

$$\varphi_R(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad x \in B(x_R, R), \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \backslash B(x_R, 2R), \end{cases} \qquad |\nabla \varphi_R(x)| \leq C/R. \tag{5.5}$$

Define $u_R := \varphi_R u_{\mu_1}$, then by (5.4) and (5.5), it is easy to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_R|^2\,dx &\leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2\,dx + CR^N; \\ \int_\Omega |u_R|^2\,dx &\geq \int_\Omega |u_{\mu_1}|^2\,dx - CR^{N+2}; \\ \int_\Omega |u_R|^{2^*}\,dx &\geq \int_\Omega |u_{\mu_1}|^{2^*}\,dx - CR^{N+2^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists $t_R > 0$ independent of $\beta < 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t>0} E_\beta(tu_R, 0) = E_\beta(t_R u_R, 0) &= \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_R|^2 + \lambda_1 u_R^2)}{\left(\mu_1 \int_\Omega |u_R|^{2^*}\right)^{2/2^*}} \right)^{N/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_{\mu_1}|^2 + \lambda_1 u_{\mu_1}^2) + CR^N + CR^{N+2}}{\left(\int_\Omega \mu_1 |u_{\mu_1}|^{2^*} - CR^{N+2^*}\right)^{2/2^*}} \right)^{N/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{NB_{\mu_1} + CR^N + CR^{N+2}}{(NB_{\mu_1} - CR^{N+2^*})^{2/2^*}} \right)^{N/2} \\ &\leq B_{\mu_1} + CR^N \quad \text{for } R > 0 \text{ small enough.} \end{aligned}$$

Recall U_R in Theorem 5.1, we have $U_R(\cdot - x_R) \cdot u_R \equiv 0$, and so $(t_R u_R, U_R(\cdot - x_R)) \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ for all $\beta < 0$. Since $N \geq 6$, one has $N > \frac{2N-4}{N-4}$. Then we see from Theorem 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\beta<0} B_\beta &\leq E_\beta(t_R u_R, U_R(\cdot - x_R)) = E_\beta(t_R u_R, 0) + E_\beta(0, U_R(\cdot - x_R)) \\ &= E_\beta(t_R u_R, 0) + J_R(U_R) \\ &\leq B_{\mu_1} + CR^N + \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} - C_2 R^{\frac{2N-4}{N-4}} \\ &< B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} \quad \text{for } R > 0 \text{ small enough.} \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, we also have $\sup_{\beta<0} B_\beta < B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. This proof is similar to the proof of [17, Theorem 1.4] in case $N = 4$. The novelty here is that, with the help of Lemma 5.1, we can exclude conclusions (1)-(2) in case $N \geq 6$. Let $\beta_n < 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $\beta_n \to -\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, and (u_n, v_n) be the positive least energy solutions of (1.1) with $\beta = \beta_n$. By Lemma 3.1, $E_{\beta_n}(u_n, v_n) \leq A$ and so (u_n, v_n) is uniformly bounded in H by (1.5). Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u_\infty, \quad v_n \rightharpoonup v_\infty \text{ weakly in } H_0^1(\Omega),$$

Then, by following the proof of [17, Theorem 1.4] in case $N = 4$, we can prove that $\int_\Omega \beta_n u_n^p v_n^p \, dx \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and passing to a subsequence, one of the following conclusions holds.

(1) $u_n \to u_\infty$ strongly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $v_n \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ (so $v_n \to 0$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$), where u_∞ is a positive least energy solution of

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2} u, \ u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} B_{\beta_n} = B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}. \tag{5.6}$$

(2) $v_n \to v_\infty$ strongly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u_n \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ (so $u_n \to 0$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$), where v_∞ is a positive least energy solution of

$$-\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 |v|^{2^*-2} v, \ v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} B_{\beta_n} = B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}. \tag{5.7}$$

(3) $(u_n, v_n) \to (u_\infty, v_\infty)$ strongly in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u_\infty \cdot v_\infty = 0$ for almost $x \in \Omega$, where $u_\infty \not\equiv 0, v_\infty \not\equiv 0$ satisfy

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_\infty|^2 + \lambda_1 u_\infty^2) = \int_\Omega \mu_1 u_\infty^{2p}, \tag{5.8}$$

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla v_\infty|^2 + \lambda_2 v_\infty^2) = \int_\Omega \mu_2 v_\infty^{2p}, \tag{5.9}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} B_{\beta_n} = E(u_\infty, v_\infty). \tag{5.10}$$

Moreover, if u_∞ and v_∞ are both continuous (we will prove this later), then $u_\infty \cdot v_\infty \equiv 0$, $u_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is a positive least energy solution of

$$-\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \mu_1 |u|^{2^*-2} u, \ u \in H_0^1(\{u_\infty > 0\}),$$

and $v_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is a positive least energy solution of

$$-\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \mu_2 |v|^{2^*-2} v, \ v \in H_0^1(\{v_\infty > 0\}).$$

Furthermore, both $\{v_\infty > 0\}$ and $\{u_\infty > 0\}$ are connected domains, and $\overline{\{v_\infty > 0\}} = \Omega \backslash \overline{\{u_\infty > 0\}}$.

Note that (5.6)-(5.7) imply that one of (1) and (2) in Theorem 1.4 does not hold in some cases. For example, if we assume that $-\lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 0$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ in Theorem 1.4, then $B_{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_2^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2} < B_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{N}\mu_1^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} S^{N/2}$, and so (2) in Theorem 1.4 does not hold, since (5.7) contradicts with Lemma 3.1.

In particular, Lemma 5.1 implies that neither (1) nor (2) hold in case $N \geq 6$. That is, only (3) holds if $N \geq 6$. Therefore, if we assume here the continuity of u_∞ and v_∞ in conclusion (3), the proof is complete. $\square$

From the previous proof, it suffices to prove that u_∞ and v_∞ are continuous. As pointed out in Remark 1.4, the following proof is completely different from that in [17] for the case $N = 4$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let (u_∞, v_∞) be in conclusion (3). Then $u_\infty - v_\infty$ is a least energy sign-changing solution of (1.12), and u_∞, v_∞ are both continuous.*

Proof. Consider the problem (1.12). Its related functional is

$$P(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_1 (u^+)^2 + \lambda_2 (u^-)^2) - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega (\mu_1 (u^+)^{2^*} + \mu_2 (u^-)^{2^*}).$$

It is standard to prove that P is C^1 and its critical points are solutions of (1.12). Define

$$J_i(u) = \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda_i u^2 - \mu_i |u|^{2^*}), \quad i = 1, 2,$$
$$\mathcal{S} = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) : u^\pm \not\equiv 0, J_1(u^+) = 0, J_2(u^-) = 0\},$$
$$m = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{S}} P(u).$$

Then any sign-changing solutions of (1.12) belong to $\mathcal{S}$. By (5.8)-(5.9), we have $u_\infty - v_\infty \in \mathcal{S}$ and so $m \leq P(u_\infty - v_\infty) = E(u_\infty, v_\infty)$. For any $u \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $(u^+, u^-) \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ for all β. Then by (5.10) we see that

$$P(u_\infty - v_\infty) = E(u_\infty, v_\infty) = \lim_{n\to\infty} B_{\beta_n} \leq E(u^+, u^-) = P(u), \quad \forall\, u \in \mathcal{S},$$

and so $P(u_\infty - v_\infty) \leq m$. That is,

$$P(u_\infty - v_\infty) = m. \tag{5.11}$$

Step 1. We show that $P'(u_\infty - v_\infty) = 0$, and so $u_\infty - v_\infty$ is a least energy sign-changing solution of (1.12).

Thanks to (5.11), the following argument is standard (see [27, 32] for example), and we give the details here for completeness.

Assume that $u_\infty - v_\infty$ is not a critical point of P, then there exists $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $P'(u_\infty - v_\infty)\phi \leq -1$. Then there exists $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1/10$, such that for $|t - 1| \leq \varepsilon_0$, $|s - 1| \leq \varepsilon_0$, $|\sigma| \leq \varepsilon_0$, there holds

$$P'(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \sigma\phi)\phi \leq -\frac{1}{2}.$$

Consider a function $0 \le \eta \le 1$ defined for $(t,s) \in T = [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}] \times [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta(t,s) = 1, \quad \text{for } |t-1| \le \tfrac{\varepsilon_0}{2},\ |s-1| \le \tfrac{\varepsilon_0}{2}, \\ &\eta(t,s) = 0, \quad \text{for } |t-1| \ge \varepsilon_0 \text{ or } |s-1| \ge \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Then for $|t-1| \le \varepsilon_0, |s-1| \le \varepsilon_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi) \\ =&P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty) + \int_0^1 P'(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \theta\varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi)[\varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi]d\theta \\ \le&P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0\eta(t,s). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sup_{t,s>0} P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty) = P(u_\infty - v_\infty) = m,$$

and for $|t-1| \ge \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$ or $|s-1| \ge \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$, there exists $0 < \delta < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$ such that

$$P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty) \le m - \delta.$$

We have, for $|t-1| \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}, |s-1| \le \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$, that

$$P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi) \le m - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2};$$

for $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \le |t-1| \le \varepsilon_0, |s-1| \le \varepsilon_0$ or $\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \le |s-1| \le \varepsilon_0, |t-1| \le \varepsilon_0$,

$$P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi) \le P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty) \le m - \delta;$$

for $|t-1| \ge \varepsilon_0$ or $|s-1| \ge \varepsilon_0$,

$$P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi) = P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty) \le m - \delta.$$

So,

$$\sup_{(t,s)\in T} P(tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \varepsilon_0\eta(t,s)\phi) \le m - \delta. \tag{5.12}$$

On the other hand, for $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$, let $h_\varepsilon : T \to H_0^1(\Omega)$ by $h_\varepsilon(t,s) = tu_\infty - sv_\infty + \varepsilon\eta(t,s)\phi$, and $H_\varepsilon : T \to \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$H_\varepsilon(t,s) = (J_1(h_\varepsilon(t,s)^+), J_2(h_\varepsilon(t,s)^-)).$$

Note that for any $(t,s) \in \partial T$, we have $\eta(t,s) = 0$ and so $h_\varepsilon(t,s) \equiv h_0(t,s) = tu_\infty - sv_\infty$. Moreover,

$$H_0(t,s) = (J_1(tu_\infty),\ J_2(sv_\infty)).$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\deg(H_{\varepsilon_0}(t,s), T, (0,0)) = \deg(H_0(t,s), T, (0,0)) = 1,$$

that is, there exists $(t_0, s_0) \in T$ such that $h_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$, which is a contradiction with (5.12).

Step 2. We show that u_∞ and v_∞ are continuous.

By Step 1, $u_\infty - v_\infty$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.12). Then by a Brezis-Kato argument (see [8]), we see that $u_\infty - v_\infty \in L^q(\Omega)$, $\forall\, q \geq 2$. In particular,

$$\mu_1 u_\infty^{2^*-1} - \mu_2 v_\infty^{2^*-1} - \lambda_1 u_\infty + \lambda_2 v_\infty \in L^q(\Omega),\ \forall\, q > N.$$

Then by elliptic regularity theory, $u_\infty - v_\infty \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ with $q > N$. By Sobolev embedding, we have $u_\infty - v_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. Since $u_\infty = (u_\infty - v_\infty)^+$ and $v_\infty = (u_\infty - v_\infty)^-$, we see that u_∞ and v_∞ are both continuous. This completes the proof and so completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $N \geq 6$. Actually, by Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 5.2, we have proved that the problem (1.12) has a least energy sign-changing solution $u_\infty - v_\infty$. Obviously, Theorem 1.5 is a direct corollary by letting $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. □

References

[1] T. Aubin, Problemes isoperimetriques et espaces de Sobolev, *J. Diff. Geom.,* **11** (1976), 573-598.

[2] N. Akhmediev, A. Ankiewicz, Partially coherent solitons on a finite background, *Phys. Rev. Lett.,* **82** (1999), 2661-2664.

[3] A. Ambrosetti, E. Colorado, Standing waves of some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *J. London. math. Soc.,* **75** (2007), 67–82.

[4] B. Abdellaoui, V. Felli, I. Peral, Some remarks on systems of elliptic equations doubly critical in the whole $\mathbb{R}^N$, *Calc. Var. PDE.,* **34** (2009), 97-137.

[5] A. Ambrosotti, P. H. Rabinowitz, Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications, *J. Func. Anal.,* **14** (1973), 349–381.

[6] Adimurthi, S. L. Yadava, An elementary proof of the uniqueness of positive radial solutions of a quasilinear dirichlet problem, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.,* **127** (1994), 219-229.

[7] T. Bartsch, N. Dancer, Z.-Q. Wang, A Liouville theorem, a priori bounds, and bifurcating branches of positive solutions for a nonlinear elliptic system, *Calc. Var. PDE.,* **37** (2010), 345-361.

[8] H. Brezis, T. Kato, Remarks on the Schrodinger operator with singular complex potentials, *J. Math. Pures Appl.,***58** (1979), 137-151.

[9] H. Brezis, L. Nirenberg, Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.,* **36** (1983), 437-477.

[10] A. Castro, J. Cossio, J. M. Neuberger, A sign-changing solution for a superlinear Dirichlet problem, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.,* **27** (1997), 1041-1053.

[11] L.A. Caffarelli, F.-H. Lin, Singularly perturbed elliptic systems and multi-valued harmonic functions with free boundaries, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.,* **21** (2008), 847-862.

[12] L. A. Caffarelli, J. M. Roquejoffre, Uniform Höder estimates in a class of elliptic systems and applications to singular limits in models for diffusion flames, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.,* **183** (2007), 457-487.

[13] G. Cerami, D. Fortunato, M. Struwe, Bifurcation and multiplicity results for nonlinear elliptic problems involving critical Sobolev exponents, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare-Analyse, Nonlin.,* **1** (1984), 341-350.

[14] G. Cerami, S. Solimini, M. Struwe, Some existence results for superlinear elliptic boundary value problems involving critical exponents, *J. Funct. Anal.,* **69** (1986), 289-306.

[15] M. Conti, S. Terracini, G. Verzini, Asymptotic estimates for the spatial segregation of competitive systems, *Adv. Math.,* **195** (2005), 524-560.

[16] Z. Chen, W. Zou, On the Brezis-Nirenberg problem in a ball, *Differential and Integral Equations,* **25** (2012), 527-542.

[17] Z. Chen, W. Zou, Positive least energy solutions and phase separation for coupled Schrödinger equations with critical exponent, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.,* **205** (2012), 515-551.

[18] G. Devillanova, S. Solimini, Concentration estimates and multiple solutions to elliptic problems at critical growth, *Adv. Diff. Equ.,* **7** (2002), 1257-1280.

[19] N. Dancer, J. Wei, T. Weth, A priori bounds versus multiple existence of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger systems, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré AN.* **27** (2010), 953-969.

[20] B. Esry, C. Greene, J. Burke, J. Bohn, Hartree-Fock theory for double condesates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.,* **78** (1997), 3594-3597.

[21] D. J. Frantzeskakis, Dark solitons in atomic Bose-Einstein condesates: from theory to experiments, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.,* **43** (2010) 213001.

[22] D. Gilbarg, N. S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Second edition, Grundlehren 224, *Springer, Berlin*, (1983).

[23] S. Kim, On vector solutions for coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations with critical exponents, *preprint*.

[24] Yu. S. Kivshar, B. Luther-Davies, Dark optical solitons: physics and applications, *Physics Reports* **298** (1998), 81-197.

[25] T. Lin, J. Wei, Ground state of N coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \leq 3$, *Commun. Math. Phys.,* **255** (2005), 629-653.

[26] Z. Liu, Z.-Q. Wang, Multiple bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger systems, *Commun. Math. Phys.,* **282** (2008), 721-731.

[27] Z. Liu, Z.-Q. Wang, On the Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz superlinear condition, *Adv. Nonl. Stud.,* **4** (2004), 563-574.

[28] L. Maia, E. Montefusco, B. Pellacci, Positive solutions for a weakly coupled nonlinear Schrödinger systems, *J. Diff. Equ.,* **229** (2006), 743-767.

[29] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, G. Verzini, Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.,* **63** (2010), 267-302.

[30] B. Sirakov, Least energy solitary waves for a system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, *Commun. Math. Phys.,* **271** (2007), 199-221.

[31] M. Struwe, Variational methods- applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems, springer, 1996.

[32] A. Szukin, T. Weth, the method of Nehari manifolds, Handbook of Nonconvex Analysis and Applications, D.Y. Gao and D. Motreanu eds., International Press, Boston, 2010, 597-632.

[33] M. Schechter, W. Zou, On the Brezis-Nirenberg Problem, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **197** (2010), 337-356.

[34] G. Talenti, Best constant in Sobolev inequality, *Ann. Mat. Pure Appl.,* **110** (1976), 352-372.

[35] J. Wei, T. Weth, Radial solutions and phase separation in a system of two coupled Schrödinger equations, *Arch. Ration. Meth. Anal.,* **190** (2008), 83-106.

[36] J. Wei, T. Weth, Asymptotic behaviour of solutions of planar elliptic systems with strong competition, *Nonlinearity,* **21** (2008), 305-317.

[37] J. Wei, W. Yao, uniqueness of positive solutions to some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Anal.,* **11** (2012), 1003-1011.

[38] M. Willem, Minimax theorems, Birkhäuser, 1996.